California Journal

A MONTHLY DIGEST OF STATE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Special: Complete Statewide and District Election Results

Counties in Finance Squeeze

Farm Labor Enters New Phase

Social Security Pass-On Signed

Governor's Education Task Force

Unity and Diversity in Farm Bloc

October 1970 in Review

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editor's Note

This month the *Journal* once again violates its "month in review" format by publishing November news as a supplement to the October issue. As with the May issue, this month's *Journal* was delayed long enough to insert the first complete statewide results available anywhere. Every effort was made to assure accurate as well as timely figures. Detailed statistical and political analysis will follow in the November issue published early in December.

At the immediate right is a circulation report required each year by the post office. We thought you might be interested in a couple of other facts as well. In the two months since the issue on which that report was based, subscriptions have increased 30 percent, and October was the best revenue month since the publication began. This is especially worth mentioning since we passed a minor landmark recently. With the publication of our last issue we became the longest-surviving magazine of state government news in California. Because of the excellent reception the *Journal* has received, we've graduated from the local poverty area listing, and our prospects for long-term survival are reasonably secure. And in the fledgling magazine business it's survival that counts.

William H. Geyer, Associate Editor of the *California Journal,* is responsible for two major articles this month. As usual he has written the Third House article, this month describing the people and organizations who comprise the "farm bloc" in Sacramento. The changing organizational patterns and tactics he describes in this piece are in part a result of vast changes in agriculture during the last decade. Not least of these changes is the partial unionization of California farm workers. Geyer's second article focuses on the impact of the farm labor movement on growers, and discusses directions of possible future legislative efforts. The article reflects Geyer's eight years' experience as Consultant to the Assembly Agriculture Committee and his intimate familiarity with this complex subject.

Ann B. Jenkins, Assistant Editor of the *Journal,* spent the better part of a month researching and writing the article beginning on page 284 about the complex issues and tactics involved in the five-year-long social security pass-on battle. Mrs. Jenkins is the author each month of California Calendar and State Government Reports and has authored several other articles for the *Journal.* Since she manages to do all this while raising two small boys, she was a logical choice to share additional responsibility for this month's interview with the director of the Advisory Commission on the Status of Women.

Next month the Journal will launch a new feature which we have tentatively called "I Propose . . ." The purpose of this feature is to provide a platform for enlightening discussion of state policy issues and, above all, for the presentation of new substantive state government policy proposals. This forum is open to government leaders, participants and observers and to all who share a concern for our state and the welfare of its citizens. We invite the submission of articles for inclusion in this new section.

California Journal

1108 O Street, Sacramento, California 95814
916/444-2840

EDITOR
Thomas R. Hoeber

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Judson Clark ..... Executive Departments
Jerome Evans ..... Education and Fiscal Affairs
Victor H. Fazio ..... Legislation and Politics
William Geyer ..... Agriculture and Resources

Assistant Editors: Ann B. Jenkins, Beverly W. Lane
Washington Correspondent: Lou Cannon
Counsel: Conrad Klein
Assistant to the Editor: Shirley Biondi
Subscription Manager: Gay Clark
Business Secretary: Jackie Timmons

Information Service
Victor H. Fazio, Director
G. L. Sherwood, Assistant

October, 1970 Volume 1, Number 10

Copyright 1970 by California Journal, 1108 "O" Street, Sacramento, California 95814; Judson Clark, President; Victor H. Fazio, Vice President; Jerome Evans, Treasurer; William Geyer, Secretary. Rates are based on membership of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Sacramento, California.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

DATE OF FILING: OCTOBER 1, 1970

TITLE OF PUBLICATION

CALIFORNIA JOURNAL

FREQUENCY OF ISSUE: Monthly

LOCATION OF KNOWN OFFICE OF PUBLICATION: 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

LOCATION OF GENERAL BUSINESS OFFICES OF THE PUBLISHERS: 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHER AND EDITOR: California Journal (Inc.) 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Thomas R. Hoeber, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

OWNER: California Journal, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; Judson Clark, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; Jerome Evans, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; William Geyer, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; Victor H. Fazio, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; Thomas R. Hoeber, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

KNOWN BONDHOLDERS, MORTGAGEES, AND OTHER SECURITY HOLDERS OWNING OR HOLDING 1 PERCENT OR MORE OF TOTAL AMOUNT OF BONDS, MORTGAGES OR OTHER SECURITIES: None

FOR COMPLETION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AUTHORIZED TO MAIL AT SPECIAL RATES: Not applicable

EXTENT AND NATURE OF CIRCULATION	Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months	Actual Number of Copies of Single Issue Published Nearest To Filing Date
A. TOTAL NO. COPIES PRINTED	1,330	2,000
B. PAID CIRCULATION		
1. SALES THROUGH DEALERS AND CARRIERS, STREET VENDORS AND COUNTER SALES	200	180
2. MAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS	720	1,158
C. TOTAL PAID CIRCULATION	920	1,338
D. FREE DISRIBUTION BY MAIL, CARRIER OR OTHER MEANS	360	612
E. TOTAL DISTRIBUTION	1,280	1,950
F. OFFICE USE, LEFT-OVER, UNACCOUNTED, SPOILED AFTER PRINTING	50	50
G. TOTAL	1,330	2,000

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.
THOMAS R. HOEBER, Editor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contents: October in Review

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT: COMPLETE STATEWIDE ELECTION RESULTS

Counties Are Also Caught In Local Finance Squeeze 280

County government tax rates continue their upward climb as county officials attempt to bridge growing gap between demands for service and current revenues.

Farm Labor Issue Enters New Phase 282

Recent victories by Cesar Chavez's UFWOC may be forcing growers to reconsider their opposition to state farm labor legislation.

Legislative-Executive Duel Ends With Signing Of Social Security Pass-On Bill 284

Assemblyman John Burton's persistent fight for state legislation allowing social security increases to aged welfare recipients presents a fascinating case study in legislative-executive maneuvering.

Governor's Task Force Examines Education Costs And Management 286

Unpublicized task force on education prepares a major legislative program for 1971 covering public school support, school administration, educational objectives, and the cost of higher education.

Third House: Unity And Diversity In The Farm Bloc 290

A rundown of farm organizations and lobbying groups demonstrates the variety of economic and political interests that form the farm lobby's loose coalition.

Interview: Mrs. Carolyn C. Heine On The Status Of Women 292

Mrs. Heine, Executive Director of the state Advisory Commission on the Status of Women, gives her views on women's rights movement.

Analyst Reports On Federal Aid Funds 295

Recent Books On California Government 299

Washington Letter by Lou Cannon 289
State Government Reports 298
People in the News 296
California Calendar 297
Legislative Hearing Schedule 297

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FEATURE

Counties Are Also Caught In Local Finance Squeeze

In the July and August issues, California Journal *reported on the revenue problems faced by California's cities and school districts. This series, dealing with what has been termed "the growing fiscal crisis of local government," continues with a discussion and analysis of the financing of county government, and particularly the recent sharp increases in county tax rates. The fourth part of the series, which will appear in the November issue, will deal with the state's response to the local fiscal crisis.*

California's 58 county governments are rapidly developing a "revenue gap" which county officials say is every bit as serious as that confronting many of California's school districts and cities. Perhaps the best evidence of this is the fact that the counties were willing to join with the California Teachers Association in putting Proposition 8 on the June primary ballot. That ill-fated measure, which would have increased state aid to local government for schools, welfare, health care, and property tax relief by a total of more than a billion dollars, was overwhelmingly rejected by voters. Predictably, that defeat weakened the chances of the counties to obtain tax relief by the more traditional route, through the Legislature.

Tax Rates Up

Another, more direct indicator of the counties' growing fiscal problem is to be found in the well-publicized increase in countywide tax rates for 1970-71. According to data compiled by the California Taxpayers Association, tax rates are going up in 44 counties this year while remaining the same in four counties and going down in only ten. In several counties the increase will be very steep. For example, among the five largest counties, four are raising tax rates by 17 percent or more. One of these four, Los Angeles, is increasing its general countywide tax rate by 40 percent.

Change in General County Tax Rates
Five Largest Counties

	General Countywide Tax Rates 1969-70	1970-71	Change
Los Angeles	$2.91	$4.09	+$1.18
Orange	1.67	1.70	+ 0.03
San Diego	2.35	2.75	+ 0.40
Alameda	2.25	2.92	+ 0.67
Santa Clara	2.06	2.44	+ 0.38

In testimony before legislative committees in 1968 the County Supervisors Association reported that according to their projections the counties were faced with a "revenue gap" of approximately $428 million over the two-year period 1970-71 and 1971-72. This gap, they said, represents the amount by which property taxes must be increased just to meet the expected normal growth of existing county services. Two years later the $428 million figure was revised upward to just over $600 million.

County officials and their representatives have been more successful in expressing the seriousness of the problem, however, than in explaining its causes and in developing politically acceptable solutions. Despite their strong expressions of concern over what they see as a growing gap between county governmental responsibilities and county financial resources, county officials have done remarkably little to pinpoint the specific causes of their problems and to spell out why some counties appear to be reasonably healthy financially while others are clearly in trouble.

Back to the Legislature

It is reasonably certain, however, that the counties, together with the school districts and the cities, will descend on the Legislature in 1971 with unprecedented demands for greater apportionments of state funds for local assistance, tax relief and direct program support. Although they made modest gains in 1967 and 1968, those gains are now all but forgotten following the twin defeats in 1970 and the sharp increases in county tax requirements for 1970-71. Anticipating this action, the Legislative Analyst and other legislative staff are now assembling some facts which the state can use to assist it in formulating a response. Similar studies, particularly in the field of educational finance (see page 286), are being pressed in the Governor's Office. There can be little doubt that the state's response to the local financial "crisis" will be one of the major issues of the next legislative session.

County Revenue Sources

Budgeted county expenditures for 1969-70 amounted to a total statewide of $3.9 billion, excluding expenditures by the City and County of San Francisco for which county expenditures alone are not identifiable. Just over half of this cost was met from local revenues, principally property taxes. On the average, the counties take 28 percent of property tax revenue while the cities take 11 percent, school districts take 52 percent, and other special districts take nine percent. The balance of county costs, now 46 percent, is met from state and federal funds.

Over the period 1959-60 through 1968-69, county property tax revenues grew from $550 million to $1,189 million, with an average growth rate of nine percent per year. Over the same period, however, expenditures have risen by an average of nearly 11 percent per year. Until recently this gap was closed by increases in other revenue sources (state and federal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Source of Funding for County Budgets*
1969-1970

	Amount (Millions)	Percent
Current property taxes	$1,220	31%
Other local revenues	721	18
Fund balances	175	5
Subtotal	$2,116	54%
State and federal aid	1,833	46
	$3,949	100%

*Excludes San Francisco City and County

aid plus non-tax revenue); but in 1967-68 and 1968-69 property tax revenues had to be raised by 11 percent each year to keep pace with budget requirements. And when budgets for 1968-69 and 1969-70 jumped by more than 16 percent each year, the counties in many cases found that similar increases were required in their property tax rates.

Total county property tax collections have risen slowly but regularly in relation to total personal income from 1959-60 through 1968-69. In 1959-60, property tax collections were equivalent to 1.34 percent of personal income; nine years later they had risen to 1.55 percent. Although the increase may appear small in these terms, it clearly indicates that county general property tax rates have become more of a burden both absolutely and relatively, rather than remaining in fixed proportion to rising income.

County Costs

The principal items of cost for county government are general county administration, public protection (courts, sheriffs, jails), roads, and public assistance (welfare, county general assistance, health care). Although public assistance is by far the largest item of county expenditure, accounting for more than half the total, its impact on county taxes is often exaggerated. State and federal subventions are expected to provide for approximately $1.3 billion or 60 percent of public assistance costs for 1969-70. Thus, although recent increases in the number of welfare recipients has pushed county budgets up sharply, much of the actual cost is borne by the state and federal government rather than the county property tax.

Budgeted County Expenditures*
By Function, 1969-70

	Amount (Millions)	Percent
Administration and general	$ 586	14.8%
Public protection	555	14.0
Roads	311	7.9
Health and Sanitation	159	4.1
Public assistance	2,165	54.8
Education	57	1.4
Recreation and cultural services	49	1.2
Debt service	24	.6
Other public services	5	.2
Contingencies and reserves	38	1.0
	$3,949	100.0%

*Excludes City and County of San Francisco

Recent increases in county expenditures for public protection (law enforcement) and other services which are almost entirely county supported have a much more direct and immediate impact on county finances. It is for this reason that county efforts to gain greater aid from state tax funds have shifted from an emphasis on welfare costs in 1960-1964 to a concern for the state's "lagging partnership" in the whole range of state-local programs in 1964-1966, and to a demand for general tax relief and "tax reform" since 1967.

High and Low Rate Counties Compared

A comparison of high tax rate counties with counties which have maintained a low countywide rate points toward some of the real reasons for recent tax increases. The average tax rate for the eight counties with the highest countywide rate in 1969-70 was $3.39 per $100 in assessed valuation. For the eight counties with the lowest rates, the average was $1.81. This difference in general county rates carried into total average property tax rates, for which the high county rate counties averaged $9.45 while the low county rate counties averaged $7.34. However, even the high rate counties fell below the statewide average of $9.92.

A Comparison of Counties With High County Tax Rates and Those With Low Rates, 1969-70

	Eight Counties* With Highest County Tax Rates	Eight Counties** With Lowest County Tax Rates	State-wide Average
County general tax rates	$3.39	$1.81	—
Total average tax rate	$9.45	$7.34	$9.92
Grossed assessed valuation per capita	$2,320	$4,149	$2,714
Assessment ratios	21.9%	22.7%	23.1%
Percentage increase in assessed valuation 1957-58 to 1968-69	69.0%	106.6%	87.3%
Percentage increase in population 1957-58 to 1968-69	24.1%	53.5%	39.5%
Percentage of population outside of cities	65.4%	52.3%	24.0%
Budgeted expenditures per capita	$293	$282	$293
Expenditures for public assistance per capita	$139	$87	$109
Property tax revenue as percentage of personal income (weighted average)	2.01%	1.30%	1.59%
Percent of budget financed from current property tax	24.9%	21.9%	30.8%

*San Joaquin, Trinity, Sacramento, Yuba, Lassen, Del Norte, Stanislaus, and Mendocino Counties
**Amador, Ventura, Mariposa, Plumas, San Mateo, Sutter, San Benito, and Orange Counties

(Continued on page 288)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Farm Labor Issue Enters New Phase

The issue is still open to some debate, but it appears that 1970 may well go down in history as the year that Cesar Chavez's United Farmworkers Organizing Committee (UFWOC) turned the corner in its six-year campaign to represent the employees of California's number one industry.

Although Chavez had won a series of isolated contracts dating back to 1966, he had previously failed to crack the united front presented by his original target, the rank and file table grape growers in the San Joaquin and Coachella Valleys. Indeed, developments during 1969, including failure to successfully conclude negotiations with a group of 12 major growers and the collapse of an anti-pesticide campaign apparently designed as the "second front" for the celebrated grape boycott, had given rise to speculation that UFWOC might actually be losing the war of attrition.

Nevertheless, the 1970 grape harvest had barely started when a number of prominent Coachella Valley growers, beset with economic difficulties not wholly attributable to the strike and boycott, decided that working with the union was preferable to fighting it. Soon afterwards, the rest of the growers, including long-time hold-outs in the Delano area, followed suit, ending the grape boycott and making grapes the first major agricultural commodity to be solidly unionized below the processing employee level.

Jurisdictional Dispute

Almost before the ink was dry on the grape contracts, UFWOC became embroiled in an equally bitter battle over the right to organize field workers in the California fresh vegetable industry, which is headquartered in the Salinas Valley. There, major grower-shippers and the Western Conference of Teamsters, which has traditionally exercised representation rights over transportation and related processing employees in the vegetable industry, had concluded a brief strike with an agreement that recognized the Teamsters as the representative of field workers as well.

The Teamsters had engaged in occasional organizational efforts among field workers previously, and in 1961 actually signed a contract including some field employees of the largest independent Salinas grower-shipper, Bud Antle. However, UFWOC, which had done some low-profile organizing in Salinas, construed the new contract to be in direct violation of a jurisdictional agreement between the two unions which had been worked out in 1967 after a similar episode involving the DiGiorgio Corporation. Chavez's UFWOC launched an immediate counter-attack, including a partly successful strike and lettuce boycott.

Ultimately, top national officials of the Teamsters and the AFL-CIO (of which UFWOC is a member) reaffirmed the principle of the DiGiorgio agreement, leaving field workers to Chavez and processing workers to the Teamsters. However, final resolution of the issue in the vegetable industry may still be some distance away. As the season draws to a close in Salinas, only a few major growers have signed with UFWOC, while other members of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association (GSVA) are suing to require the Teamsters to perform on their contract (the Teamsters have offered recision to any grower requesting it). A new organization of independent growers not under contract to either union has sprung up in the southern part of the Valley, and UFWOC is making preparations to transfer the battle to winter growing areas in the Imperial Valley and Arizona, where many of the same firms are involved.

From a public policy standpoint, the consequences of this year's events are also far from clear. For one thing, it is difficult to determine whether Chavez's 1970 successes have occurred because or in spite of the legal vacuum which surrounds the organization of field workers in agriculture. Field workers have always been exempted from the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and are covered in California law only to the extent, according to a recent court ruling, that they along with other workers are entitled to civil relief if they are discriminated against because of union membership.

For years, unions argued that no organization of farm workers could succeed without the protection of the NLRA or some similar state law. However, Chavez, making a virtue of necessity, has increasingly employed practices that would be forbidden, or at least seriously curtailed, by the management rights provisions which were added to the NLRA by the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffen amendments. Chief among these tactics is the commodity boycott, which as a secondary boycott would be prohibited to employees covered by the NLRA. Other significant areas in which there is now an absence of restrictions are jurisdictional disputes (which growers believe may be illegal under California law) and representation procedures.

Conversely, UFWOC's ability to organize field workers in a conventional manner obviously has been impeded by the absence of readily enforceable unfair labor practice standards applicable to farm employers. Indeed, one interpretation of Chavez's breakthrough this year is that it is attributable primarily to improvements in grass roots organizational work in spite of this difficulty. Where the threat of brand-name boycotts has been sufficient to bring agribusiness conglomerates into the fold, effective work stoppages anchored on organizational compaigns have apparently been more persuasive with independent growers.

Government Role

Basic to the failure of government to play a decisive role in the resolution of the battle is the obvious reluctance of both of the contending parties to invite governmental intervention except on their own terms. For organized agriculture, the traditional posture has been one of opposition to the extension of the NLRA to agriculture on the grounds that agriculture is not the same as other industry, and that government regulation of farm labor-management relations is neither practical nor necessary.

In the last three years, under the pressure of the UFWOC campaign, Calfornia farmers have modified this position and have come to recognize the desirability of some type of separate labor law for agriculture.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Efforts in this direction focused last year upon legislation (S. 2203) introduced by U.S. Senator George Murphy. Much of Murphy's bill is patterned after the NLRA, and it includes such basic provisions as the right of unobstructed organizing and a requirement for management to bargain in good faith. It departs from NLRA principles, however, in placing a greater emphasis upon protecting free choice in the marketplace (outlawing the commodity boycott), permitting an uncompensated moratorium on coercive labor activity which will result in crop injury or loss (the "no strike at harvest" clause), and requiring a secret ballot election as a prerequisite to union recognition. In addition, it creates a separate three-man administrative board in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and vests proportionately less enforcement authority with the board than with the courts.

S. 2203, ballyhooed as the Consumer Agricultural Food Protection Act of 1970, was pushed vigorously by several California farm organizations, particularly those related to fresh fruit and vegetable industries, and endorsed by a number of others, some of whom seemed to view it largely as an exercise in public relations. The bill received additional grower endorsements outside of California, but it ran into opposition from labor-leaning farm groups as being insufficiently similar to the NLRA, and from traditionalist groups as being a cure worse than the disease. In any event, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, after receiving the bill through a parliamentary maneuver by Murphy, never reported it out.

Labor's Position

The position of organized labor on the issue was equally mixed. The traditional AFL-CIO position has been one of support for a simple removal of the agricultural exemption in the NLRA, a proposal (S. 8 in the present Congress) sponsored in recent years by Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey. Although an early supporter of this concept, Chavez never devoted much time to its legislative implementation and late in 1969, startled some of his supporters by indicating support for S. 8 only if agricultural coverage could be freed of the restrictions on union activity (including secondary boycotts) added by later amendments to the NLRA. S. 8, assigned to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was also not reported out.

The one position that both UFWOC and California growers were able to agree on at a series of hearings held by the Assembly Committee on Agriculture late in 1969 was that national legislation was preferable to state action. The reasoning of the growers was that state law could not deal effectively with a national boycott and might place California farmers at an additional competitive disadvantage with farmers elsewhere. For its part UFWOC seemed to prefer its political chances in Washington to those in Sacramento, believing that any state legislation and its subsequent implementation by the Reagan administration would be pro-grower. This atitude of mutual disinterest in state legislation held through the 1970 session.

Since the positions of both sides reflect their independent assessments as to which side is winning under present arrangements, speculation on what will happen during 1971 is subject to reevaluation upon any shift in the present balance of power. Currently, several growers groups seem to be backing away from the "federal law only" approach. This appears to reflect not only the progress of UFWOC and frustration with the apparent stalemate in Congress, but a growing realization that, as with the extension of the national minimum wage law to agriculture, any law that Congress is likely to pass may be drafted in such a way as to limit its application as much as possible to California. Further, some growers are coming to believe that commodity boycotts, as practiced by Chavez, depend upon consumer action to such an extent that they may be beyond the direct control of sanctions traditionally applied to secondary boycotts, no matter what level of government applies them.

It is still far too early to discern what form grower-backed state legislation might take. Several proposals, antecedents of the Murphy bill, have been drafted and circulated in farm circles during the last few years. The Reagan administration has given cautious support on several occasions to an expanded "conciliation" approach, and the State Board of Agriculture, an advisory body headed by California Farm Bureau Federation President Allan Grant, recently endorsed use of the existing conciliation facilities as well as efforts to achieve state and national legislation.

Assembly Bill

One other possible model is AB 1333, a measure introduced by rural Republican Assemblymen Victor V. Veysey and William M. Ketchum, which failed to win approval of Ketchum's Assembly Committee on Agriculture. The bill provided for mandatory secret representation elections upon employee petition, designated the individual farm as the appropriate unit of representation, and prohibited employers from dealing with uncertified unions. Beyond this, it gave the State Board of Agriculture the power to make a determination that any farm labor dispute affected the public interest. Once such a determination was made, unfair labor practice provisions similar to those in the NLRA would be invoked by an independent "agricultural conciliator" and would be enforced both by the conciliator and the courts. These provisions included mandatory bargaining and prohibited secondary boycotts, but not strikes (except those in violation of signed contracts).

Since grower proposals are likely to be tinged with "stop Chavez" provisions, they will probably come with built-in opposition from UFWOC and the State Federation of Labor (AFL-CIO). Under these circumstances, the attitude of the Teamsters Union is likely to be pivotal. The Teamsters Union, which has managed to maintain a centerist position in Sacramento and in so doing, has gained a reputation for packing a commensurately greater degree of legislative clout than the State Federation of Labor where their own direct interests are involved, actively opposed several of the 1969 proposals, including AB 1333. Whether the somewhat shaky negotiated peace between the heretofore rival unions will continue and how it will affect the Teamsters' posture on this issue bear watching.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEGISLATURE

Legislative-Executive Duel Ends With Signing of Social Security Pass-On Bill

by Ann B. Jenkins

Legislation which would, in effect, "pass on" a $7.50 monthly social security increase to recipients of state aid to the elderly and disabled was signed into law this year after five years of legislative and administrative wrangling and behind-the-scenes maneuvers. The bill, AB 1712, although affecting some 300,000 Californians, may not be of overwhelming importance in itself. But the long-time effort expended to dispose of this politically volatile issue and the sleight-of-hand required to get the bill through the Legislature provide an uncommon study in legislative tactics.

The story begins in 1965 when Congress amended the Social Security Act to provide a seven percent increase in social security benefits, an adjustment designed to help offset increases in the cost-of-living. If the issue had been as simple as that the story could have ended right there.

However, the congressional objective in enacting the increase in social security stood to be totally negated for those beneficiaries of the system who were also receiving Old Age Security (OAS) payments. Since OAS grants take into account other sources of income, including social security payments, it was possible to merely subtract the increase in social security benefits in calculating the amount of each OAS payment. Thus, the amount paid by the state would be reduced, and those persons eligible for OAS and social security benefits would be deprived of the cost-of-living increase enacted by Congress.

Pass-On Option

To counteract this effect, Congress tacked a provision to the social security increase which gave the states the option of exempting the first $5 of outside income in computing OAS benefits. This was intended as a device to pass on the cost-of-living increase. However, federal law requires that within each aid category the rules must apply equally to all recipients. Therefore, the "pass-on" could not be limited to social security beneficiaries, but had to apply to all recipients with income from any source.

The net result was that if a state chose to ignore the pass-on option, it would benefit from a savings in the form of reduced payments to OAS recipients, but if it adopted the $5 income exemption, it would incur an increased cost equivalent to the increase in grant payments for OAS beneficiaries who have outside income but not from social security. In 1965, about 72 percent of OAS recipients were also social security beneficiaries and 28 percent were not.

California, unlike most states, has an automatic cost-of-living escalator built into its adult aid programs (including OAS). For this reason and due to the fact that the administration of Governor Edmund G. Brown was desperately trying to avoid a pre-election tax increase, California chose to decline the new pass-on option and proceeded to deduct the amount of the social security increase from welfare grants to social security recipients, thereby diverting the savings in welfare monies to the General Fund.

Brown's reluctance to endorse the pass-on option did not go unchallenged, however, and the complicated legislative history of the issue began. During the 1965 Second Extraordinary Session of the Legislature, Assemblyman John Burton, a dedicated advocate for the needy on welfare, introduced AB 4 which exempted the first $5 of any outside income from consideration in calculating a recipient's welfare grant. Burton argued that the federal government's purpose in raising social security grants was defeated by subtracting that amount from state welfare grants. "Let the elderly get what's theirs," he said.

Under Burton's bill, however, the $5 exemption applied not only to OAS benefits but to Aid to the Disabled (ATD) and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) as well. AB 4 passed the Assembly unanimously but died in the Senate Rules Committee — with the approval of the Brown administration.

Early in the budget session in 1966, Burton and a delegation from the California League of Senior Citizens met with Governor Brown to urge him to call a special session for reconsideration of pass-on legislation. (Prior to 1967, the even-year sessions were only for consideration of the budget.) In the course of the stormy confrontation, Assemblyman Burton charged Brown administration officials with using false figures in opposing his 1965 bill. Brown walked out in anger, and refused to call a special session.

Compromise is Reached

Nevertheless, a compromise was worked out later to amend the budget bill to direct the State Department of Social Welfare to provide by regulation for an additional $4 "special need" allowance for the aged. Rather than a pass-on provision, this was a straight one-year increase of $4 for every OAS recipient. Brown at first opposed this compromise, but during his 1966 re-election campaign, he was stung by charges that he was insensitive to the needs of the elderly, and he decided to allow the increase to remain in the 1966 budget.

When Governor Reagan's new administration took over in 1967, his initial budget, contrary to a campaign promise, did not include the $4 special need allowance. When Reagan discovered that his budget conflicted with his public utterances, however, he reinstated the $4 allowance, and it has been retained in subsequent state budgets.

A Second Try

But the special need compromise did not settle the pass-on question. A bill was introduced in each house in 1967 to provide that future increases in social security benefits would be exempted in computing income for OAS beneficiaries. Thus, such increases would be passed on to all OAS recipients. The Senate version,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SB 990, authored by Senator Stephen P. Teale, passed both houses (58-2 in the Assembly and 30-2 in the Senate) but was vetoed by Governor Reagan.

In his veto message, Governor Reagan stated: "Recipients who have social security income would receive preferred treatment as compared to other recipients who do not have such income. It would thus establish a higher standard of living for recipients of social security." This remark summarized one of the administration's continuing arguments in opposing the pass on concept — that it would be a "discriminatory grant increase" because the aged who do not receive social security benefits (12 percent of OAS beneficiaries) would be excluded. As an additional argument, Governor Reagan stated: "It has always been expected that the social security benefit program would eliminate the necessity for old age assistance."

In that same year, Congress again raised social security benefits, this time by 13 percent, and increased the amount of income the states could exempt under Aid to the Totally Disabled and Aid to the Blind, as well as under OAS, from $5 to $7.50. Having vetoed SB 990, however, the Reagan administration decided to ignore the pass-on option and to keep the savings from the reduced welfare grants. At the beginning of the 1968 Session, Assemblyman Burton got back into the fight by introducing AB 25, a bill similar to his earlier pass-on bill. This time he succeeded in getting this bill through both houses, after a good deal of legislative maneuvering, only to have it vetoed by Senate President pro Tem Hugh Burns. Burns was Acting Governor while Reagan and Lt. Governor Finch were attending the Republican convention in Florida.

JOHN BURTON Hügo

A Third Try

In 1969, Burton attempted to sidestep the administration's opposition to "discriminatory grant increases" by proposing a $7.50 across-the-board increase in benefits for all OAS recipients. In testifying against the Burton bill, Social Welfare Director John Montgomery argued that this would result in misplaced priorities. He contended that any increase in welfare benefits should go first to needy children, noting that AFDC had received no cost-of-living adjustment since 1962. Burton's 1969 bill died in the Senate Committee on Labor and Social Welfare.

But now election time had returned and the pass-on question threatened to become a troubling issue for Reagan, just as it had been for Brown four years earlier. Of the 317,000 aged persons receiving OAS benefits in California, now 80 percent, or more than 250,000, are also social security beneficiaries. Some 60,000 disabled would also benefit from pass-on legislation, making a potential total of 300,000 voters directly interested in the issue.

Assemblyman Burton, well aware of these facts, introduced two bills in the 1970 session — AB 6 and AB 40, each with 46 co-authors. AB 6, which pertained to the 1969 federal legislation which required the states to exempt $4 in income in computing the needs of all OAS, blind and disabled beneficiaries, died in Senate Finance. The second Burton bill, AB 40, would have exercised the option, permittted by federal law, of disregarding the first $7.50 of income in determining an OAS recipient's grant. Assemblyman Burton could not get this bill out of the Assembly Health and Welfare Committee, largely because the majority of the committee agreed with Committee Chairman Gordon W. Duffy's argument that the AFDC recipients deserved any increase that was to come out of the 1970 session. This, of course, was the same argument used a year earlier by the administration. However, Duffy was himself carrying AB 1360, which he labeled the administration's "welfare reform package" and which did provide for some increase in AFDC aid.

Duffy Offers Compromise

Undaunted by the committee vote, Burton moved to tack a pass-on "rider" to AB 1360 when it got to the Assembly floor, and his amendment was accepted by the Assembly 44-17. Later in the session, when the bill went to a conference committee to work out disagreements between the Senate and Assembly (and to insure that the bill was adequately funded), the author, Assemblyman Duffy, refused the amendment but agreed to a compromise. The compromise allowed an additional $4 payment to all those not covered under the federally mandated $4 exemption amended into the Social Security Act in 1969, in return for Burton's agreement to deletion of the pass-on provision.

Having lost the most likely vehicle for sending the pass-on to the Governor in a form likely to assure the Governor's signature, Burton began immediately to scout for another bill into which he could amend the pass-on provision. Defeat of the Duffy bill on the night before the last day of the session meant that even the compromise $4 increase was lost unless another bill was amended and passed. AB 1712, a bill authored by Assemblyman Larry Townsend for the Southern Council of the Blind, which was then in the Senate, was selected for this purpose. Instead of amending the pass-on provision into the bill in the Senate, however, Burton arranged to have a minor change made there, sending it back to the Assembly for a vote on whether to accept the Senate amendment. Townsend then asked for nonconcurrence and the bill was sent to a conference committee. Burton and Townsend arranged for a friendly conference committee

(Continued on page 294)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDUCATION

Governor's Task Forces Examines Education Costs and Management

Late last spring the Reagan administration launched what may be its single most extensive effort at major program development to date. The foundation for this effort is a broad scope, heavily staffed study of the administration and finance of Calfornia's public schools and institutions of higher education. If this project achieves a substantial portion of its objectives, it is certain to have a major impact not only on the work of the 1971 Legislature but also on the structure of education throughout the state.

For some unexplained reason, however, the administration has chosen to undertake this study in semi-secrecy and with very little assistance from persons who are considered to be experts in these fields. Apart from one or two references in campaign speeches by the Governor and a single story in the *Los Angeles Times* regarding one part of the study, its purposes and procedures have gone unreported. Apparently this has been a matter of policy rather than chance.

John Kehoe, an educational consultant in the Governor's office and a co-director of the study, told the *California Journal* that the administration preferred to maintain a "low profile" for the study until it is completed to minimize interference from the many interest groups in the education field. James S. Dwight, Jr., Chief Deputy Director of the Department of Finance and the study's other co-director, was more blunt. He refused to discuss any aspect of the study, saying that the press would be informed as to the nature and results of the study when it has been completed, but no sooner.

Because this study has been shrouded in semi-secrecy and because we believe that many of our readers have more than a passing interest in its details, we shall report what we have been able to learn about it at greater length than would otherwise be necessary. The *Journal* has pieced this story together from a number of sources, including several persons with first hand knowledge of the project.

Origin of the Study

The study apparently originated in May during the legislative debate over public school support and the Governor's tax program. It was reported at that time that the Governor agreed to study the need for additional school funds in order to secure the Democratic votes necessary to get his tax bills through the Assembly. Initially the study was to be a quick two-week assessment of the need for additional school support and potential sources of funds by the Department of Finance. Those who undertook that assignment soon learned, however, that the problem was not that easily resolved and that any useful recommendations would require a study in much greater depth.

By this time the Governor was committed to producing some serious recommendations. Consequently it was decided to undertake a major effort with the objective of examining every facet of school management and finance and to produce a report which the Governor could present to the Legislature early in the 1971 session. A "task force" was formed for this purpose with Dwight and Kehoe as co-directors. Staff assistance was to be drawn from the Programs and Policy Office, Audits Division and Budget Division of the Department of Finances and from a number of other state agencies as required.

Initially, the study was to deal only with the public elementary and secondary schools. Separate committees were set up to work on each of six principal elements of the study: "fiscal reorganization," "management audit," "master plan," "educational audit," "educational model," and "communication of education's program effectiveness." The meaning of each of these headings isn't entirely clear, even to those conducting the study, but in most cases the work has gone on long enough to establish the context of the study.

(1) *Fiscal reorganization.* The committee on fiscal reorganization was assigned the task of simplifying existing state school apportionment formulas and improving statewide equalization. Although much publicity has been given to the Governor's suggestion for the implementation of a "voucher plan" system of school support, this has been discussed very little by the committee. Principal emphasis is upon understanding the working of the current system and looking for ways to eliminate special allotments and categorical aids which have been built up around the foundation programs. The community colleges are included in this part of the study in addition to the elementary and secondary schools.

(2) *Management audit.* This phase of the study is a large-scale audit of school district management and administration under the direction of the Audits Division of the Department of Finance. Thirty state auditors, plus some 25 auditors made available as a "public service" by private firms, have been assigned to this study. Following a preliminary sample study, 110 school districts were chosen by stratified random sample for detailed examination by audit teams. The district examinations are structured on a functional basis covering personnel administration, data processing, EDP, transportation, purchasing, insurance, and nearly every other major element of school administration. The field work began in September, and a final report is to be prepared by mid-December. That report is to deal with each major function and to provide a management profile on each of the districts studied.

(3) *Master plan.* This element of the study is believed to be concerned with developing a set of goals

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or objectives for the public schools. These goals are to be sufficiently specific to be used in conjunction with any proposed new state financing system both as program objectives and as a means of measuring the educational "ouput" of the schools.

(4) *Educational audit.* This is an attempt to apply cost-benefit analysis to selected school instructional programs. It is expected to provide the necessary link between the statement of goals under the "master plan" phase of the study and the revised system of state funding to be developed under the "fiscal reorganization" phase.

(5) *Educational model.* A federal grant of $30,000 has been obtained through the Department of Education to pay the Rand Corporation to "provide the Department of Education with prototype computer model(s) and information which will allow it to assess resource and cost consequences of alternative education program choices on a statewide basis." That is, Rand is to prepare a computer simulation model of the public school system on which various alternative proposals for state financial assistance can be tried and assessed prior to their actual implementation. In addition, the model is to assist in the identification and analysis of "exemplary" programs in teaching, vocational education, etc. This is to be completed by December 31st.

(6) *Communication of education's program effectiveness.* This final element of the task force's study is expected to deal with the application of program budgeting to public school management at all levels. The specific objectives have not been identified as yet.

All six elements of the study are to be brought together by the Program and Policy Office under the direction of Dwight, who has assumed the principal role in the study. A detailed initial schedule for review and reporting calls for completion of the major elements of the study by January 15th, at which time preparation of legislative recommendations is to begin. This legislative program is to be presented to the Legislature by Governor Reagan on March 15th. Several elements of the work have fallen behind schedule, however, and the period for review and the preparation of legislation may be delayed and shortened as a consequence.

Higher Education Also Covered

Shortly after the study of school finance was launched, those directing the project concluded that it should be broadened to include a study of higher education. Accordingly, a higher education task force was established to conduct a parallel effort dealing with state support for the state colleges and universities. This task force is also working under the direction of James Dwight, who has assigned day-to-day supervision to Al M. Loeb of the Department of Finance's Budget Division.

The work of the higher education task force has been divided into three parts: "productivity," "enrollment and admissions," and "budget and accounting systems."

(1) *Productivity.* Specific studies under this heading include an analysis of faculty workload, a review of the objectives and effectiveness of state support for research and "public service programs" of the University of California, an evaluation of class size in relation to support and capital outlay costs, establishment of support standards for state college libraries, establishment of higher classroom utilization rates, a review of the need for "low-yield" graduate programs, and an evaluation of the California Maritime Academy.

(2) *Enrollment and admissions.* This part of the study will deal with such matters as the development of long-range enrollment projections, a review of admission standards and policies, a review of student financial aid resources and EDP programs, a review of admission requirements and tuition for non-residents, and the assignment of responsibility for adult education.

(3) *Budgeting and accounting systems.* As the third element of the study the task force is to recommend the development and implementation of a management information system and a program budget structure for the three segments of public higher education. The management information system is to be patterned after the national system developed by the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

The present study outline makes no reference to such matters as governance, coordination, or planning, although these factors are closely related to subjects which are included in the study. According to a press report in September, Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs, the Governor's chief education advisor, talked of the higher education study as a re-appraisal of the 1960 Master Plan with particular emphasis upon the level of support for higher education and methods of reducing state costs. Those who are engaged in the study, however, do not believe that it will produce any significant reorganization proposals.

Research Assignments

As in the case of the public school study, the institutions are being asked to provide such information on costs and administration as are needed, but they have not been given a part in shaping the study itself or in advising upon its direction and results. State College Chancellor Glenn Dumke, who took part in the 1960 Master Plan study, has expressed strong concern about the absence of consultation with state college officials but apparently with little effect.

In carrying out the study an effort has been made to utilize state personnel from a number of offices, so as to spread the cost of the project, while assigning individuals topics in which they are likely to have little direct interest. Thus, James G. Stearns, Director of the Department of Conservation, is studying vocational and adult education; John R. Teerink, Deputy Director of Water Resources, is examining instructional workload; Corporation Commissioner Anthony R. Pierno is studying higher education funding alternatives; and Frank Toffet, a division chief for the State Personnel Board, is to make recommendations regarding plant utilization standards.

It remains to be seen what will be produced from a study conducted in this manner. Rather than drawing upon expert advice and dealing with such criticism as may arise during the course of the study, those responsible for its direction apparently hope to carry on the study unencumbered by outside views until such time as the Governor is prepared to announce his program. Although this has always been a tempting way to conduct the public's business, it has seldom been one which by its results commends itself to repetition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With respect to assessed valuation, the high rate counties fell somewhat below the statewide average of $2,714 per capita, as might be expected, while the low rate counties were considerably above that figure. A similar relationship appears for the growth rates for assessed valuation over the ten-year period 1957-58 to 1968-69. But both groups fell below the statewide average for assessment ratios, with the high rate counties somwhat below the low rate counties.

The counties with the highest tax rates increased in population by only 24 percent between 1957-58 and 1968-69, 14 percentage points below the statewide average. The low rate counties exceeded the statewide average for population growth by roughly the same margin. Both groups were well above average, however, in the percentage of their population residing in unincorporated areas, because the statewide average is heavily weighted by the Los Angeles and San Francisco population centers. Although the high rate counties had somewhat more unincorporated area than the low rate counties (including Alpine County which has no incorporated city) the two groups were surprisingly similar in terms of geography and population density.

In terms of budgeted county expenditures the high rate counties reported average budgeted expenditures per capita of exactly the same amount as the statewide average, $293. The low rate counties budgeted only slightly less per capita, an average of $282. Although these averages conceal wide ranges within each group, it is significant that the average differences are very small as compared with the differences in average county tax rates. Expenditures per capita for public assistance alone are, however, more nearly in line with tax rates. The high tax rate counties spend 60 percent more per capita than the low rate counties and 28 percent more than the statewide average.

Not surprisingly, all of this is reflected in a final statistic showing current property tax revenue as a percentage of personal income (1968). By this measure the high rate counties again rank well above the state average while the low rate counties fall somewhat below.

If these figures can be summed up, it would appear that a county with a high county general tax rate is likely to have a relatively low assessed valuation per capita, low growth rates for both assessed valuation and population, and relatively high expenditures per capita for public assistance. To a lesser extent it is also likely to have a somewhat lower than average assessment ratio, a higher percentage of population outside of cities, a level of total expenditures per capita which is equal to or higher than the statewide average, and a somewhat higher than average dependence on current property taxes as a revenue source.

What the Counties Say

In analyzing their own fiscal situation, county officials make these points:

- If the revenue system available to local government will not meet the level of services demanded by its citizens and determined by a higher level of government, that revenue system must be acknowledged to be inadequate. The inadequacy of the existing county tax base, which is restricted largely to property taxes (63 percent) and user charges (24 percent), is becoming more obvious each year.
- Not only is the county tax base generally inadequate in the face of expenditure demands, but due to its composition it fails to grow with other measures of economic growth. It must therefore be adjusted frequently by means of tax rate increases which antagonize the people who demand additional services. The property tax base fails to grow with personal income (has a low "income elasticity") in the manner in which the state's personal income tax does.
- The county property tax is subject to a high degree of voter opposition because it is not closely related to the individual taxpayer's ability to pay or to the benefits he receives. It is particularly important to understand that the property tax is highly regressive — hits low income individuals harder than high income taxpayers — in comparison with sales and income taxes.
- It is often the state which establishes new levels of service for governmental programs, but when the state attempts to reduce the level of service or ignores the impact of inflation on program costs, it shifts a greater cost burden on local government which, being closer to the program beneficiaries, cannot so easily ignore their expectations.

In January, it will once more be up to the Governor and the Legislature, to assess the merits of these statements and to attempt to meet the demands of the counties for "tax relief" and "tax reform" in a manner which will meet the problem effectively without denying the state the resources it also needs to meet its responsibilities.

The five counties with the highest county tax rates for 1970-71:

Yuba	$5.21
Stanislaus	4.60
Sacramento	4.35
Alpine	4.16
Los Angeles	4.09

And the five counties with the lowest rates:

Mariposa	$1.64
San Benito	1.68
Orange	1.70
Plumas	1.97
Lake	2.01

CORRECTIONS

Page 258, Col. 3 — The correct vote margins for Assemblyman Karabian for 1966 and 1968 are 666 and 3583 respectively.

Page 260, Col. 2 — Senator Mills has not been chairman of the Senate Democratic Caucus since January 1970 when he was succeeded by Senator Dymally.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California Journal Supplement

Complete Election Results

On the following pages are results of the November 3rd General Election for all constitutional offices and for Congress, the State Senate and the Assembly. Results were obtained from the Secretary of State, but remain unofficial until certified at a later date. All but 3 of the 21,700 precincts are included. Incumbents are capitalized, winners are underlined, and party designations are: American Independent, A; Democratic, D; Peace and Freedom, P; and Republican, R.

****

All but one member of "Team '70", the slate of Republican statewide candidates led by Governor Ronald Reagan, were elected to office. The single loser was James L. Flournoy who was defeated by Democrat Edmund G. Brown, Jr. in the race for Secretary of State. The significance of the election, however, was that this Republican triumph contained within it the defeat of U.S. Senator George Murphy by Congressman John V. Tunney, the loss of both houses of the Legislature, a gain of only one seat in California's congressional delegation, and the upset defeat of School Superintendent Max Rafferty by Wilson Riles.

State Controller Houston I. Flournoy proved to be the leading vote-getter with 3.7 million votes. Flournoy, State Treasurer Ivy Baker Priest, and Lt. Governor Ed Reinecke all ran ahead of Governor Reagan. The closest race was that for Attorney General; Evelle Younger won over Charles O'Brien by 90,258 votes.

Neither the bluntly partisan campaign waged by Unruh nor the last-minute appeal from President Nixon had any apparent impact on the traditionally independent California voters who continued to practice ticket-splitting with their usual abandon. Paradoxically, there were indications that the Unruh campaign did have the effect of firming up party loyalty in specific areas, such as the middle and lower-middle class regions of Los Angeles County where blue-collar Democrats returned to the Democratic column in sufficient numbers to give local candidates victory margins reminiscent of the 1964 Democratic landslide.

In the final analysis, the Reagan victory, solid as it was, rested on the former Assembly Speaker's inability to crack voter confidence in Reagan's integrity, the main target of the Unruh strategy. The returns suggested, however, that four years in the Governor's office have taken a toll on Reagan's popularity with the electorate. He suffered a 300,000 vote drop from his 1966 victory margin and was not effective in his attempt to unseat Democratic Senators who successfully blocked the passage of his property tax program.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Statewide Races

Governor

REAGAN	(R)	3,382,203	52.9%
Unruh	(D)	2,878,896	45.1
Shearer	(A)	64,586	1.0
Romo	(P)	64,547	1.0

Lt. Governor

REINECKE	(R)	3,461,512	54.9
Alquist	(D)	2,663,413	42.2
Hemp	(A)	83,245	1.3
Haag	(P)	101,476	1.6

Secretary of State

Brown	(D)	3,163,857	50.3
Flournoy	(R)	2,873,436	45.7
Goodloe	(A)	144,456	2.3
Feuer	(P)	107,781	1.7

Controller

FLOURNOY	(R)	3,712,460	60.3
Cameron	(D)	2,294,430	37.3
Weber	(P)	146,299	2.4

Treasurer

PRIEST	(R)	3,626,102	58.4
Gordon	(D)	2,467,654	39.7
Hampton	(P)	118,078	1.9

Attorney General

O'Brien	(D)	2,994,042	47.9
Younger	(R)	3,084,300	49.3
Buckley	(P)	174,560	2.8

U.S. Senator

MURPHY	(R)	2,828,127	44.4
Tunney	(D)	3,425,984	53.8
Ripley	(A)	60,181	.9
Scheer	(P)	55,517	.9

Superintendent of Public Instruction

RAFFERTY	2,716,369	45.9
Riles	3,195,555	54.1

Board of Equalization

1st District

REILLY	(D)	552,449	67.6
Bagdonas	(R)	226,797	27.8
Bartalini	(A)	37,850	4.6

2nd District

LYNCH	(D)	870,219	70.4
Corneille	(R)	342,314	27.7
Chalko	(A)	24,028	1.9

3rd District

Bennett	(D)	248,923	50.8
Kettenhofen	(R)	229,000	46.7
Mortara	(A)	12,524	2.5

4th District

NEVINS	(D)	1,916,468	55.7
Jarvis	(R)	1,449,405	42.1
Cushman	(A)	77,716	2.2

Propositions

		Yes	%	No	%
Prop. 1	WATER BONDS	4,313,225	75.5%	1,402,999	24.5%
Prop. 2	CONST. VACANCIES	2,570,458	49.5	2,621,124	50.5
Prop. 3	STATE BUDGET	2,955,492	54.8	2,440,529	45.2
Prop. 4	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	2,557,087	46.9	2,899,138	53.1
Prop. 5	REGENTS MEETINGS	3,661,799	67.4	1,773,372	32.6
Prop. 6	TEACHER FUNDS	3,606,612	68.2	1,680,128	31.8
Prop. 7	ASSEMBLY SPEAKER	2,654,233	50.4	2,607,164	49.6
Prop. 8	SUPT. OF INSTRUCTION	2,094,402	40.0	3,138,728	60.0
Prop. 9	SUPT. OF SCHOOLS	2,379,898	46.2	2,770,171	53.8
Prop.10	INTEREST RATE	2,343,875	45.0	2,864,111	55.0
Prop.11	CHIROPRACTORS	3,621,346	69.3	1,601,959	30.7
Prop.12	COUNTY SUPERVISORS	2,575,693	50.6	2,511,814	49.4
Prop.13	VETERANS	4,652,992	83.4	924,663	16.6
Prop.14	CIVIL SERVICE	2,794,053	54.4	2,341,011	45.6
Prop.15	CONST. REVISION	2,982,477	59.3	2,048,753	40.7
Prop.16	CONST. AMENDMENTS	2,552,262	51.4	2,418,029	48.6
Prop.17	CONST. REVISION	3,524,887	69.7	1,533,251	30.3
Prop.18	SMOG FUNDS	2,648,287	45.9	3,121,611	54.1
Prop.19	USURY LAW	3,695,295	71.6	1,467,921	28.4
Prop.20	WILDLIFE BONDS	3,084,360	56.8	2,349,676	43.2

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress

The reapportionment of 1967 which redistricted the state's 38 congressional seats in favor of the incumbents once again proved too much for challengers to overcome.

Incumbents were re-elected in every case. Democrats Ronald Dellums in the 7th District of Alameda County and George Danielson in the 29th District in the west San Gabriel Valley won election in two heavily Democratic areas. Dellums who defeated Congressman Jeffrey Cohelan in the June Primary received 57.4 percent of the vote.

In close races, Democratic Congressman Richard Hanna won with 54.4 percent of the vote in his second race against William Teague. In a surprise, William Mailliard of the Marin-San Francisco 6th District won with only 53.1 percent of the vote against a former aide of Congressman John V. Tunney.

The only "cliff hanger" of the 38 contests saw another Tunney aide, Dave Tunno, lose to Assembly Education Committee Chairman Victor Veysey. He won the 38th District seat formerly held by the new U.S. Senator by 3,000 votes thereby bringing the delegation partisan breakdown to 20 Democrats and 18 Republicans.

1st District

CLAUSEN	(R)	108,322	63.4%
Kortum	(D)	62,544	36.6

2nd District

JOHNSON	(D)	150,732	77.7
Gilbert	(R)	37,617	19.4
Carrigg	(A)	5,725	2.9

3rd District

MOSS	(D)	117,250	61.6
Duffy	(R)	69,663	36.6
Priest	(A)	3,541	1.8

4th District

LEGGETT	(D)	101,963	67.4
Gyorke	(R)	49,374	32.6

5th District

BURTON	(D)	74,062	70.7
Parks	(R)	30,657	29.3

6th District

MAILLIARD	(R)	93,637	53.1
Miller	(D)	82,781	46.9

7th District

Dellums	(D)	88,865	57.4
Healy	(R)	63,844	41.2
Scahill	(P)	2,125	1.4

8th District

MILLER	(D)	103,714	69.0
Crane	(R)	46,622	31.0

9th District

EDWARDS	(D)	117,413	69.3
Guerra	(R)	48,180	28.4
Kaiser	(A)	3,943	2.3

10th District

GUBSER	(R)	131,440	61.8
McLean	(D)	78,650	37.0
Stancliffe	(A)	2,536	1.2

11th District

McCLOSKEY	(R)	144,104	78.6
Gomperts	(D)	39,197	21.4

12th District

TALCOTT	(R)	95,421	63.6
Riordan	(D)	50,841	33.9
Foster	(P)	3,720	2.5

13th District

TEAGUE	(R)	127,120	58.5
Hart	(D)	87,646	40.4
Jordet	(A)	2,335	1.1

14th District

WALDIE	(D)	148,343	74.6
Athan	(R)	50,641	25.4

15th District

McFALL	(D)	96,305	62.8
Van Dyken	(R)	55,044	35.9
Gillings	(A)	1,959	1.3

16th District

SISK	(D)	95,106	66.4
Sanchez	(R)	43,841	30.6
Scott	(A)	4,237	3.0

17th District

ANDERSON	(D)	80,321	62.1
Donaldson	(R)	46,184	35.7
Copeland	(A)	1,640	1.3
Mathews	(P)	1,205	.9

18th District

MATHIAS	(R)	86,797	63.3
Miller	(D)	48,665	35.5
Hensley	(A)	1,721	1.2

19th District

HOLIFIELD	(D)	94,880	70.3
Jones	(R)	40,063	29.7

20th District

SMITH	(R)	112,829	69.2
Stolzberg	(D)	48,192	29.6
Harper	(A)	1,981	1.2

21st District

HAWKINS	(D)	70,567	94.6
Johnson	(R)	4,050	5.4

22nd District

CORMAN	(D)	91,636	59.3
Hayden	(R)	61,229	39.6
Johnson	(A)	1,776	1.1

23rd District

CLAWSON	(R)	74,925	63.5
Chapman	(D)	43,089	36.5

24th District

Evers	(D)	59,818	32.3
ROUSSELOT	(R)	120,686	65.2
Scanlon	(A)	2,894	1.6
Kaplan	(P)	1,788	.9

25th District

WIGGINS	(R)	111,965	63.5
Craven	(D)	61,610	34.9
Scanlon	(A)	2,831	1.6

26th District

REES	(D)	124,570	71.2
Friedman	(R)	45,280	25.9
Hallinan	(A)	1,555	.9
McCammon	(P)	3,495	2.0

27th District

GOLDWATER	(R)	135,348	66.8
Kimmel	(D)	61,537	30.4
Hind	(A)	2,541	1.3
Richer	(P)	3,172	1.5

28th District

BELL	(R)	149,487	69.4
McLaughlin	(D)	55,597	25.8
Gordon, D.	(A)	5,532	2.6
Gordon, J.	(P)	4,793	2.2

29th District

Danielson	(D)	68,433	62.4
McMann	(R)	41,215	37.6

30th District

ROYBAL	(D)	60,829	68.2
Cavnar	(R)	26,739	30.0
Belousov	(A)	1,571	1.8

31st District

WILSON	(D)	97,842	73.0
Casmir	(R)	36,222	27.0

32nd District

HOSMER	(R)	116,020	71.6
Mallonee	(D)	42,964	26.5
Donohue	(P)	3,110	1.9

33rd District

PETTIS	(R)	116,059	72.2
Wright	(D)	44,751	27.8

34th District

HANNA	(D)	100,042	54.4
Teague	(R)	80,967	44.1
Rayburn	(A)	2,784	1.5

35th District

Lenhart	(D)	86,066	30.3
SCHMITZ	(R)	190,447	67.0
Halpern	(P)	7,655	2.7

36th District

WILSON	(R)	131,489	71.6
Hostetter	(D)	44,484	24.2
Davis	(A)	2,703	1.5
Koppelman	(P)	5,078	2.7

37th District

VAN DEERLIN	(D)	93,142	72.1
Kuhn	(R)	31,669	24.5
Brice	(A)	2,937	2.3
Thygeson	(P)	1,372	1.1

38th District

Tunno	(D)	84,373	48.5
Veysey	(R)	87,331	50.1
Pasley	(A)	2,478	1.4

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State Senate

A major upset occured in San Mateo County's 12th State Senate District where attorney Arlen Gregorio defeated veteran Republican Assemblyman Carl Britschgi by almost 9,000 votes. In Alameda County, former State Senator John Holmdahl unseated Republican incumbent Lewis Sherman in a race that was expected to be close. These two victories give the Democratic Party a 21-19 seat edge in the State Senate. The election of State Senator George E. Danielson to Congress, however, leaves the Democrats with only a one-vote margin.

2nd District

MARLER	(R)	88,320	65.5%
Lucas	(D)	46,453	34.5

4th District

Peevey	(D)	67,095	45.6
Behr	(R)	76,142	51.8
Smart	(A)	3,810	2.6

6th District

SHORT	(D)	103,815	66.7
Riddle	(R)	49,377	31.7
Chalk	(A)	2,496	1.6

8th District

SHERMAN	(R)	148,381	48.0
Holmdahl	(D)	156,037	50.5
Winslow	(A)	4,790	1.5

10th District

MOSCONE	(D)	159,880	74.7
Spinosa	(R)	49,701	23.2
Kimbley	(A)	4,397	2.1

12th District

Gregorio	(D)	98,689	51.0
Britschgi	(R)	90,867	46.9
Bullock	(A)	4,069	2.1

14th District

BRADLEY	(R)	106,886	52.7
Rutherford	(D)	92,001	45.4
Herrell	(A)	3,766	1.9

16th District

Zenovich	(D)	62,635	52.3
Smittcamp	(R)	54,976	45.9
Decker	(A)	2,153	1.8

18th District

STIERN	(D)	63,020	54.6
Park	(R)	50,586	43.9
Fisher	(A)	1,695	1.5

20th District

COOMBS	(R)	82,578	54.2
Smith	(D)	67,354	44.2
Sharp	(A)	2,485	1.6

22nd District

CARRELL	(D)	82,335	54.5
O'Nan	(R)	65,884	43.6
August	(A)	2,839	1.9

24th District

LAGOMARSINO	(R)	126,854	66.2
Herron	(D)	61,662	32.2
Collins	(A)	3,232	1.6

26th District

BEILENSON	(D)	117,889	70.5
Shipp	(R)	46,082	27.5
Braunger	(A)	3,368	2.0

28th District

SONG	(D)	90,093	70.7
Nichols	(R)	35,168	27.7
Fortner	(A)	2,100	1.6

30th District

WALSH	(D)	80,281	63.7
Temple	(R)	38,717	30.7
Walters	(A)	7,009	5.6

32nd District

DILLS	(D)	86,093	72.3
Halliwell	(R)	30,419	25.6
Anno	(A)	2,543	2.1

34th District

Mize	(D)	84,499	30.6
Carpenter	(R)	186,565	67.7
Ellzey	(A)	4,654	1.7

36th District

COLOGNE	(R)	132,029	82.3
Meadows	(A)	28,312	17.7

38th District

BURGENER	(R)	131,241	70.2
Larsen	(D)	51,701	27.6
Smith	(A)	4,018	2.2

40th District

MILLS	(D)	68,471	65.8
Boney	(R)	33,423	32.1
Leavitt	(A)	2,184	2.1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Assembly

Republicans reaped bitter disappointment from their well-advertised Cal-Plan campaign to control both houses of the Legislature for the upcoming reapportionment session. Instead of the expected Republican gains in key Cal-Plan districts, only one Democratic seat changed hands and five Republican incumbents were unseated.

In the Fresno seat vacated by newly elected Democratic State Senator George Zenovich, Republican moderate Kenneth Maddy defeated Councilman P. J. Camaroda. Republicans lost the following seats: in San Diego where Peter Chacon defeated incumbent Assemblyman Tom Hom who, along with other city and county officials was indicted by the county grand jury prior to the election; in Los Angeles, where Democrat Jim Keysor won an unexpected upset victory over Republican Henry Arklin of Pacoima; in Modesto, where Democrat Ernest La Coste won a rematch of his special election loss to Clare L. Berryhill; in San Jose, where two-term Assemblyman Earle Crandall met defeat at the hands of Democratic attorney Alister McAlister; and in the Oakland-Piedmont-Berkeley district where veteran Assemblyman Don Mulford lost by an unexpectedly large margin to attorney Ken Meade who was successful in his second attempt to defeat Mulford, Republican caucus chairman.

The 42-37 margin, which gives Democrats control of the legislative redistricting, also ushers in a leadership contest to replace Republican Speaker Bob Monagan. Several veteran Democrats have been mentioned as prospective candidates including Carlos Bee, Joe Gonsalves, John Knox, and Bob Moretti. The fight during the 1970 session for the post of minority leader, which resulted in the election of John Miller to replace Jess Unruh, revealed the presence of several factions among Assembly Democrats which could prove troublesome in a speakership battle.

1st District

DAVIS	(D)	54,596	72.6%
Hord	(R)	20,649	27.4

2nd District

BELOTTI	(R)	45,534	52.2
Keene	(D)	41,719	47.8

3rd District

GREENE	(D)	56,949	60.1
Nelson	(R)	37,764	39.9

4th District

JOHNSON	(R)	54,731	64.2
McMurdie	(D)	30,526	35.8

5th District

DUNLAP	(D)	49,739	67.8
Thierry	(R)	21,988	30.0
Haus	(A)	1,613	2.2

6th District

CHAPPIE	(R)	58,317	64.9
Kennedy	(D)	29,117	32.4
Ellis	(A)	2,432	2.7

7th District

BAGLEY	(R)	61,544	58,1
Forest	(D)	41,206	38.9
Bernd	(A)	3,203	3.0

8th District

POWERS	(D)	40,423	59.6
Werlhof	(R)	25,891	38.2
Hutchins	(A)	1,459	2.2

9th District

Z'BERG	(D)	49,001	69.7
Pahlman	(R)	21,303	30.3

10th District

DENT	(R)	62,184	59.7
Dickinson	(D)	40,524	38.9
Campbell	(A)	1,429	1.4

11th District

KNOX	(D)	58,223	68.0
Fuller	(R)	25,855	30.2
Dietrich	(A)	1,562	1.8

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

12th District

MONAGAN	(R)	50,323	68.0
Nickerson	(D)	22,851	30.9
Witmer	(A)	871	1.1

13th District

BEE	(D)	70,188	72.1
Olson	(R)	24,717	25.4
Goodman	(A)	2,465	2.5

14th District

CROWN	(D)	42,766	73.5
Muegenburg	(R)	13,911	23.9
Verges	(A)	1,520	2.6

15th District

FONG	(D)	52,462	72.5
Castle	(R)	18,308	25.3
Kraemer	(A)	1,629	2.2

16th District

MULFORD	(R)	31,467	41.5
Meade	(D)	44,399	58.5

17th District

MILLER	(D)	46,964	85.4
Karlson	(R)	7,268	13.2
Rhea	(A)	789	1.4

18th District

BROWN	(D)	31,120	66.5
Pagliaro	(R)	15,688	33.5

19th District

McCARTHY	(D)	45,078	72.6
Payne	(R)	15,910	25.6
Holzen	(A)	1,077	1.8

20th District

BURTON	(D)	26,015	67.7
Graf	(R)	11,488	29.9
McCracken	(A)	900	2.4

21st District

DUFFY	(R)	41,167	68.1
Cheney	(D)	19,279	31.9

22nd District

Croft	(D)	42,092	37.9
Hayden	(R)	66,108	59.5
Brooks	(A)	2,883	2.6

23rd District

FORAN	(D)	44,962	74.9
Binderup	(R)	13,882	23.1
Szafarski	(A)	1,211	2.0

24th District

VASCONCELLOS	(D)	55,383	56.1
Shaffer	(R)	41,623	42.2
Faulkner	(A)	1,725	1.7

25th District

CRANDALL	(R)	48,858	44.5
McAlister	(D)	56,939	51.8
Fine	(A)	1,624	1.5
Stearns	(P)	2,403	2.2

26th District

Schoorl	(D)	39,798	40.2
Arnett	(R)	56,646	57.2
Cooney	(A)	2,577	2.6

27th District

RYAN	(D)	66,097	73.1
Sherman	(R)	20,827	23.0
Lynch	(A)	3,497	3.9

28th District

STACEY	(R)	34,229	55.3
Whittemore	(D)	26,471	42.8
Charlton	(A)	1,199	1.9

29th District

KETCHUM	(R)	38,167	66.4
Berrigan	(D)	18,203	31.7
Prewitt	(A)	1,101	1.9

30th District

BERRYHILL	(R)	38,036	47.9
LaCoste	(D)	39,710	50.0
Beery	(A)	1,622	2.1

31st District

MURPHY	(R)	45,878	64.8
Pfaff	(D)	24,941	35.2

32nd District

Camaroda	(D)	28,518	40.4
Maddy	(R)	40,435	57.3
Conte	(A)	1,619	2.3

33rd District

MOBLEY	(R)	43,726	66.8
Hoffman	(D)	20,375	31.2
Chalko	(A)	1,313	2.0

34th District

WOOD	(R)	39,913	68.9
Murray	(D)	15,588	26.9
Amader	(A)	1,157	2.0
Avery	(P)	1,275	2.2

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

35th District

BRIGGS	(R)	59,640	67.9
Slaven	(D)	25,779	29.4
Nichols	(A)	2,340	2.7

36th District

MacGILLIVRAY	(R)	46,354	50.9
Palmer	(D)	44,785	49.1

37th District

MacDONALD	(D)	54,980	53.2
Siple	(R)	46,421	44.9
Spatz	(A)	1,929	1.9

38th District

PORTER	(D)	40,532	67.1
Corwin	(R)	19,002	31.4
Barsby	(A)	911	1.5

39th District

HAYES	(R)	53,850	71.0
Phelan	(D)	20,371	26.9
Simpson	(P)	1,614	2.1

40th District

GARCIA	(D)	21,176	68.6
MacDonald	(R)	9,127	29.6
Cook	(A)	556	1.8

41st District

ARKLIN	(R)	33,406	45.8
Keyser	(D)	38,304	52.5
Kolb	(P)	1,272	1.7

42nd District

MORETTI	(D)	39,243	65.2
Carasso	(R)	19,929	33.1
Stevens	(A)	984	1.7

43rd District

MOORHEAD	(R)	52,405	71.6
Triphon	(D)	19,529	26.7
Brinkman	(A)	1,223	1.7

44th District

CULLEN	(D)	48,267	58.7
Smith	(R)	32,826	40.0
Howard	(A)	1,080	1.3

45th District

KARABIAN	(D)	35,508	57.3
Decker	(R)	25,426	41.1
Dixon	(A)	978	1.6

46th District

BEVERLY	(R)	68,277	68.8
Nordeck	(D)	28,734	29.0
Abshear	(A)	2,159	2.2

47th District

LANTERMAN	(R)	53,702	68.1
Hart	(D)	24,048	30.5
Fraser	(A)	1,081	1.4

48th District

ROBERTI	(D)	39,066	64.3
Sisson	(R)	19,184	31.6
Myers	(A)	925	1.5
Kaye	(P)	1,566	2.6

49th District

SCHABARUM	(R)	63,488	69.9
Fox	(D)	25,962	28.6
Olsen	(A)	1,398	1.5

50th District

CAMPBELL	(R)	35,029	51.4
Montoya	(D)	33,147	48.6

51st District

FENTON	(D)	45,405	73.3
McCoy	(R)	15,617	25.2
Emig	(A)	899	1.5

52nd District

WAKEFIELD	(R)	29,843	52.6
Jackson	(D)	25,996	45.9
Parker	(A)	856	1.5

53rd District

GREENE	(D)	31,703	92.5
Brown	(R)	2,574	7.5

54th District

COLLIER	(R)	59,950	74.3
Mandell	(D)	19,253	23.9
Scanlon	(A)	1,446	1.8

55th District

RALPH	(D)	31,692	100.0

56th District

WARREN	(D)	35,597	58.8
Ellis	(R)	24,061	39.7
Cressler	(A)	881	1.5

57th District

CONRAD	(R)	51,217	52.3
Margolin	(D)	46,667	47.7

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

58th District

JOHNSON	(D)	34,907	61.0
Turnette	(R)	21,395	37.4
DeWeese	(A)	893	1.6

59th District

SIEROTY	(D)	61,309	74.3
Solliday	(R)	19,717	23.9
Neelands	(P)	1,503	1.8

60th District

PRIOLO	(R)	52,545	53.4
Diamond	(D)	42,022	42.7
Kuxhaus	(A)	738	.7
Niemann	(P)	3,158	3.2

61st District

WAXMAN	(D)	51,674	70.8
Van Horn	(R)	21,310	29.2

62nd District

RUSSELL	(R)	57,268	70.9
Devine	(D)	22,079	27.4
McAfee	(A)	1,371	1.7

63rd District

BRATHWAITE	(D)	50,663	77.6
Hill	(R)	14,624	22.4

64th District

Cline	(R)	55,253	51.5
Ball	(D)	48,504	45.2
Woods	(A)	1,227	1.1
Evans	(P)	2,316	2.2

65th District

Pierson	(D)	41,682	73.6
Sanocki	(R)	13,719	24.2
Parsley	(A)	1,195	2.1

66th District

GONSALVES	(D)	46,651	70.8
DeGarmo	(R)	18,229	27.7
Whittington	(A)	1,035	1.5

67th District

TOWNSEND	(D)	38,253	62.0
Fredericks	(R)	22,533	36.6
Wheeler	(A)	870	1.4

68th District

THOMAS	(D)	38,487	67.0
Urrea	(R)	17,921	31.2
Hale	(A)	1,054	1.8

69th District

CORY	(D)	54,526	53.0
Nestande	(R)	46,839	45.5
Swenson	(A)	1,573	1.5

70th District

BURKE	(R)	81,160	64.0
Nocker	(D)	42,593	33.6
Vance	(A)	3,138	2.4

71st District

BADHAM	(R)	101,780	71.6
Ascher	(D)	37,001	26.0
Woods	(A)	3,314	2.4

72nd District

QUIMBY	(D)	47,791	70.6
Neigel	(R)	19,911	29.4

73rd District

LEWIS	(R)	59,917	70.3
McDaniels	(D)	23,420	27.5
Spragg	(A)	1,868	2.2

74th District

BIDDLE	(R)	60,849	63.5
Appleby	(D)	32,774	34.2
Browning	(A)	2,212	2.3

75th District

Marx	(D)	28,093	48.3
Seeley	(R)	30,126	51.7

76th District

WILSON	(R)	70,637	72.1
Reber	(D)	25,282	25.8
Moths	(A)	1,998	2.1

77th District

DEDDEH	(D)	50,356	69.6
Brink	(R)	20,664	28.5
Conwell	(A)	1,375	1.9

78th District

BARNES	(R)	45,882	62.0
Nolan	(D)	28,093	38.0

79th District

HOM	(R)	22,822	43.4
Chacon	(D)	29,009	55.1
Crepin	(A)	815	1.5

80th District

STULL	(R)	77,648	72.4
Korbel	(D)	26,807	25.0
Peacock	(P)	2,809	2.6

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Expatriot Observations

This letter is written in one candidate's bus, another candidate's airplane, and a non-candidate's motel. It is not a letter at all. It is a series of impressions recorded by one Washington reporter who remains a secret Californian and who, after a week and a half back home that seems a light year, offers these seven observations about the campaign. It is written six days before the election.

OBSERVATION NO. 1: **Today's oppressiveness is tomorrow's nostalgia.** Once the Southern Pacific that Frank Norris called The Octopus roared through the valley and ran the state. That was long ago. Today is the era of the automobile, a far more robust and dangerous octopus that throttles cities and farmland in its embrace and that is the protected creature of automobile manufacturers, oil companies, and cement producers. We would trade it all for the SP, or so it seemed to those who accompanied John V. Tunney on the senatorial candidate's San Joaquin Valley whistle-stop into the past. There was something marvelously irrelevant and faintly elegant about it. The reporting was irrelevant, too. One could interview candidate and campaign manager, actors and athletes, Democratic loyalists who had been dragooned into meeting the train and Mr. George Murphy pickets who had volunteered or been paid to attend. But what did it all mean in the television and automobile age? Bill Ames, that fine television newscaster from KNXT in Los Angeles, called it "a tone poem." He was right. Will candidates a half century hence take sentimental journeys in an automobile cavalcade?

OBSERVATION NO. 2: **Ideology is not enough.** Liberal candidates learned it the hard way, and conservative candidates, now that there are so many of them, ought to learn it, too. Putting it in the immediate context: George Murphy never should have run for a second term and everyone who is associated with him knows it. It is depressing to witness the persistent disintegration of Murphy in this campaign and to see those around him attempt to write records that will protect themselves rather than their candidate. No doubt the ego that pushes men into public life also prevents them from knowing when they are no longer fit for public office. But early retirement is now widespread in the business and industrial communities. Perhaps we ought to impose a similar system upon our public servants.

OBSERVATION NO. 3: **Political advertising is more offensive than ever.** John Tunney used the words "gutter politics" to describe an ad that viewed his vote against the District of Columbia crime bill as a vote against fire bombs. Tunney said that his vote (on the conference report of the bill, since he was absent when the House passed the measure) reflected his opposition to preventive detention features of the measure. But it is hardly a requirement that Murphy's admen reprint the entire bill. What is far more offensive, or so it seems to this reporter, is the ringing conclusion of the advertisement. "Re-elect Senator George Murphy," it declares. "A man who cares, who works hard and who believes in America." There are those of us who thought that all of the candidates believed in America.

OBSERVATION NO. 4: **Neither the public, the press, the President nor the political system is willing to come to grips with the high cost of politics.** It is the deepening elitism of the system, not just the scandalous campaign costs, that is disturbing. "I don't live on $42,500 a year but I would if I had to," Tunney piously declared during a television taping in which he battered Murphy over his Technicolor connections. However, Tunney certainly knows that scores of lawyer-congressmen remain members of law firms for much the same reason that Patrick Frawley valued Murphy's association with Technicolor. Tunney agrees that Murphy didn't cast any votes differently because of the association, but he says that "Frawley liked to have a senator to trot out at board meetings." Law firms like to trot out senators, too, and to flaunt them on their letterheads. Tunney himself has not engaged in this practice, but he has seriously misstated the problem by pretending, for political purposes, that it is an aberration peculiar to Sen. Murphy. The truth is that the cost of participating in the political system as a central player has become unbearable for persons of ordinary wealth. The truth is also, and Tunney ought to know it, that the practice he described as extraordinary is in fact commonplace. The American electoral system has never been equally open to the poor, but it deserves to be something more than the plaything of the rich.

OBSERVATION NO. 5: **Youth will be served.** No political staff in modern California history committed as many blunders as did Tunney's in the primary. No staff ever showed more improvement in the general election. It will be a long time before 29-year-old Nelson Rising (the campaign chairman) or 29-year-old Fred Port (the finance chairman) are elder statesmen. But they and several others who can still be trusted because of their proximity to age 30 did a bang-up job.

OBSERVATION NO. 6: **Voters are not idiots, at least not most of the time.** They did not sucker for Pat Brown's efforts to nominate George Christopher and they did not accept the notion that Ronald Reagan was a right-wing boob of an actor mouthing other people's lines. They won't fall for Jess' "half-hidden millionaires" thesis, either, largely because it requires people to distrust Reagan's motivations as a precondition of accepting Unruh's argument. Unruh, of all people, should have known better. Only the really bum politicians are used by the very rich. The good politicians, and Unruh used to be a very good one, use the rich to accomplish their own ends, which is one of Unruh's best rebuttals to the criticisms of his own legislative career. The real problem (see observation No. 4) is that only rich candidates can run successfully.

David Garth, who produced the television spots for Tunney, obviously understands that voters are not

(Continued on page 295)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THIRD HOUSE

Unity and Diversity in the Farm Bloc

The "farm bloc", a term which originally described the coalition of southern and mid-western legislators that pushed farm programs through Congress, is also occasionally applied, both by friends and detractors, to farm groups in California as they represent themselves before state government. The term undoubtedly exaggerates the unity of purpose of such groups, but individually and collectively they continue to have a substantial impact in Sacramento.

The decade of the 1960's was in many ways a traumatic one for farm interests in California. During the governorship of Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, farm groups were distinctly uncomfortable with the political attachment of the administration to organized labor, a problem only partially offset by Brown's close friendship with a number of prominent members of the agri-business community. On top of this, the court-ordered reapportionment of the State Senate in 1966 according to "one man, one vote" principles caused farm interests further despair because of the threat posed to what political scientists have termed "traditional rural over-representation".

In retrospect, things didn't turn out to be as bad as they seemed for the farm lobby. While Brown never received the enthusiastic support that the agricultural establishment has since accorded Ronald Reagan, he seldom was guilty of more than agonized fence-straddling on agricultural (usually labor-related) problems. Similarly, the immediate consequence of Senate reapportionment was to make the previously "rural dominated" Senate actually more conservative. This occurred primarily through the election of additional Republicans and the decimation of the Senate's liberal wing, which had been led by a handful of Democratic attorneys from moderate-sized rural cities whose districts were merged with others during reapportionment.

More Farmer-Legislators

An additional compensating factor was an actual increase in the number (currently eight) and influence of farmers or ex-farmers in the Assembly. While Senate leaders had difficulty manning the previously prestigious Senate Committee on Agriculture, the parallel Assembly committee had to be expanded in size to make room for all interested legislators.

What did take place, during the 1960's, however, was the culmination of a gradual transition in agriculture's role in the formulation of public policy. Whereas in the 19th and early 20th centuries agricultural groups had presumed, with some success, to act as the social and economic conscience of the people of the state, by the 1960's their influence had been reduced to that of one among a number of competing special interest groups. Concurrent with the realization of this change has come a gradual change in the approach of farm groups to representation. The former practice was to concentrate on rural legislators and to rely upon the farm vote to reinforce the message. Now farm groups adhere to the more normal interest group practice of taking some degree of interest in all legislators regardless of district while directing special attention to legislators who are normally pivotal to success.

The change has also resulted in an increased concentration upon issues that relate directly to agriculture and a de-emphasis of peripheral concerns. In general, however, producer-based organizations have been slower in mastering the transition to professionalism in Sacramento than those further along in the agri-business chain. Indeed, as Clarke Chambers has pointed out in his definitive study, *California Farm Organizations, 1929-1941* (University of California Press, 1952), special interest groups, including segments of agri-business, had alledgedly perfected such techniques sufficiently by the 1930's to enable them to frequently thwart producer-backed programs even in the State Senate.

General Membership Organizations

Among the multitude of farm groups represented in Sacramento, the most prominent are the general membership farm organizations. There are only two such groups: The California Farm Bureau Federation and the California State Grange, both sub-units of nation-wide bodies.

The Farm Bureau is the largest and most comprehensive of the two, with 63,000 members and a staff of over forty paid professionals. County and commodity sub-units account for much of its activity. Its four-man legislative staff, which recently moved to Sacramento, is headed by former Riverside County grower Elton Gebhardt. It has recently embarked on a major member service program in farm labor.

The Farm Bureau, both statewide and nationally, is perhaps best known for its efforts to bring government farm programs into line with its "free enterprise" philosophy, a posture that has caused occasional friction with some of its own commodity-oriented subdivisions. State President Allan Grant, a former Tulare County dairyman, also serves as President of the State Board of Agriculture under Reagan and has been a leader in efforts to secure federal action on farm labor relations legislation.

The Grange, under State Master Chester Deaver, a former Monterey County supervisor, has recently reversed a previous membership decline and has a current membership slightly in excess of 40,000. Unlike the Farm Bureau, its membership is fraternal in character. This social emphasis, together with a comparatively low dues structure, has held the Grange's legislative program development to a minimum, a condition Deaver also proposes to change. Herman Grabow, a former Escalon dairyman, and something of an institution in capitol circles, serves as legislative advocate.

The Grange is identified with the family farm tradition, including support of the 160-acre limitation, and like the Farm Bureau is a strong proponent of self-help marketing programs. Generally, the Grange supports greater government participation in the agricul-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tural economy than the Farm Bureau and is relatively less active in the labor field. Both groups provide insurance and cooperative farm supply organizations for their members, both are relatively strong within their national organization, and both have been charged occasionally with being subject to excessive non-farmer influence of various kinds.

A second type of farm organization is the commodity group. In California, with over 250 different cash crops, farmers often have a stronger identification with the commodities they produce than with general agrarian ideals. Commodity groups are consequently the "bread and butter" farm organizations and tend to prevail on occasion where economics and ideology come into conflict.

The principal commodity organization in Sacramento is the Agricultural Council, composed of 67 cooperatives representing most major California farm products. These cooperatives, although all grower-controlled, are primarily either processing and marketing organizations, such as Sunkist (the dominant organization in the citrus industry), or bargaining associations, such as the California Cling Peach Association which negotiates with private processors.

The Agricultural Council maintains a four-man Sacramento staff headed by Executive Secretary Dick Johnsen, Jr. Organizational policy emphasizes marketing problems, particularly marketing orders and standardization, but also becomes involved in some production questions, such as pest control regulations.

Milk Lobby

The milk industry, regulated in a manner similar to a public utility, accounts for more than a quarter of all agricultural bill introductions each year. Milk producers probably generate more Sacramento activity than any other single commodity group. Formerly fragmented into numerous and often antagonistic regional groups, dairymen are now grouped into two organizations, the League of California Milk Producers and the newly-formed Federated Dairymen.

The League, represented by contract lobbyist Frank Vicencia, is primarily composed of groups from the major metropolitan milksheds, while the Federated Dairymen, who will probably be represented by Joe Branco (currently manager of Western Dairymen's Association, a Federated affiliate), draws most of its membership from the Central Valley. The gradual coalesence of producer organizations during the past decade and the application of professional techniques to lobbying, spearheaded by Vicencia, was responsible for a power reversal within the industry that resulted in the passage of the long-sought Gonsalves Milk Pooling Act in 1967.

A second major organization with independent representation is the California Cattlemen's Association. Headquartered in Sacramento since 1967 under former Agricultural Council staffer Bill Staiger, the cattlemen have played a leading role in land use and tax legislation.

Several other major commodity organizations in which cooperatives are not a major factor do not maintain permanent representation in Sacramento. These include the Western Growers Association (fresh vegetables) and the Grape and Tree Fruit League (fresh fruit).

A third category of farm groups is made up of special purpose organizations. The major activity of these organizations is in the area of labor legislation. The Agricultural Conference, organized in 1964 to represents a variety of commodity groups, corporations, and other agricultural interests on labor matters, has conducted a low-profile program, generally one of opposition to proposed state legislation, under the management of California Taxpayers Association executive Bob Brown. The conference recently retained retired Farm Bureau lobbyist Bob Hanley and occasionally also receives assistance from former University of California representative Jim Corley.

The Associated Farmers of California, which gained notoriety while battling farm labor unions in the 1930's, is now virtually moribund. The Perishable Agricultural Commodities Corporation, under vegetable grower-shipper Jack Baillie of Salinas, led the drive last year for federal farm labor legislation, but has been quiescent recently also. A public relations organization, the Council of California Growers, is a general membership organization whose main financial resources come from agri-business. Formed a decade ago, it has devoted the bulk of its energies to labor and water issues and the generation of consumer sympathy for farm problems. It does not engage in formal lobbying.

Agribusiness

In the field of water legislation, major responsibility has fallen to the Irrigation Districts of California, managed by Bob Durbrow, although as in other fields the Farm Bureau also maintains a reasonably active policy interest.

A final but potent category is that of agribusiness. Chief among these is the Canners' League of California, an organization of processors represented by veteran insurance lobbyist David Oliver. The League keeps close watch over commodity standardization, cooperatives, bargaining rights, and marketing order legislation, and is also a factor in labor policy. It has gained the reputation of being effective in counter-balancing efforts to increase producer control over the marketing of agricultural commodities. The most active member of the Canners' League, Del Monte, also normally maintains individual representation in Sacramento.

(Continued on page 296)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERVIEW

CAROLYN C. HEINE; EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Carolyn C. Heine is Executive Director of the California Advisory Commission on the Status of Women. This interview, edited to fit these pages, was conducted on October 28th.

By all the resources, I mean the resources of government — not only in terms of money, but in terms of expertise — consultive assistance, licensing assistance, private, non-profit resources, churches, charitable groups, universities. I mean industry in large doses — industry that employs large numbers of employees, both men and women, and federal agencies as well — for instance, Head Start.

In the past there have been several bureaus in the State Department of Education, in the State Office of Economic Opportunity, in the State Department of Social Welfare, all of which had a responsibility for programs, services, licensing, or something to do with child care. The federal government has a similar proliferation of agencies. So this was our major recommendation: that the state needed to use a coordinated public-private approach and to specifically look for some new financial resources, because child care facilities in the state are very woefully inadequate.

According to national figures, nearly one million children in the country are what is known as "latch-key" children — children who are sent off to school each morning with a key around their neck and come home to an empty house. We had testimony in our hearings of people who have drug addicts take care of their children, but pay them at the end of the day — just for that day. That way you can be sure they come back. Relatives are also a source of child care, but sisters and relatives have a tendency to move away, and so this is not a long-term kind of solution. We also found that even with rich people, at no price can you buy adequate, reliable, on-going child care.

Journal: What did the commission have to say about education?

Heine: We recommended that the community college districts throughout the state utilize their community services tax fund to staff and offer counseling courses and services for adult community residents, providing testing, placement, and referral services. We felt, too, that there is a great need for the use of the para-professional in our society. For example, there is a great shortage of staff in the health field. Many of the tasks can be done by persons with two years of intensive training. Adult women are a fantastic source in the community for this without drawing from other sources in the labor market. We recommended that all the colleges in the state introduce programs for para-professional training, using federal or other funds.

We also recommend that much more factual materials be utilized by counselors throughout the secondary and higher education schools. Today's teenage girls, at least 6 out of 10 of them, will work full-time up to 30 years. If you knew that, you might get a different kind of training than if you thought you would just work a couple of years and then get married. We felt that counselors should get much more in-service training than is done in this state. We also recommend that continuing education programs of colleges should be geared toward homemakers who either want or need to get back into the economic mainstream — giving them more than how to make hats and arts and crafts.

Continuing education programs should have women on their advisory boards. We strongly recommended that the new college level examination program developed by the educational testing service be utilized. It can give credit for life experience — you can come in and take a test and if you pass it you can be given certain college credit for that. We also recommended that the state affirm its educational commitment to all of its citizens and that co-educational institutions adopt policies insuring that admission and financial aid are identical for both male and female.

Journal: Could you first summarize the principal recommendations the Advisory Commission made last year? To begin with, what did the commission say about child care centers?

Heine: The commission made a number of important recommendations relating to adequate child care. In reading over the recommendations of our predecessor commission, it was apparent that whatever subject women were talking about as to meeting their potential more fully, they said, "We can't even consider it, we can't even go out the door — unless there is going to be adequate child care for our children." We recommended the 4-C approach — community coordinated child care — be utilized in California. The needs in child care are so great and are so important that if all the resources of a community or state aren't brought to bear, we'll continue to have piecemeal and inadequate kinds of solutions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Journal: You also made recommendations regarding employment, I believe.

Heine: We recommended that the California Fair Employment Practices Act be amended to include a prohibition of discrimination in employment because of sex. The federal law does not have enforcement power; it does not cover a whole range of employers. Furthermore, we felt that California's employers, in fairness to them, have dealt for ten years with our FEPC, knew what to expect from them, and have actually praised them, and that it made much more sense to have one agency to deal with. We also recommended that greater publicity be given, notably to employees, on the recently amended Equal Pay Law in the state. And we had a recommendation on the weight lifting law to open-end it and also recommended that the Division of Industrial Welfare keep its jurisdiction in giving special permits for weights over certain reasonable limits.

Hugo

Journal: What success have you had with these recommendations?

Heine: In the Legislature, we have had several successes. AB 22 passed. AB 750 contains two of our child care recommendations in it: co-ordination and long-range planning. A great deal of credit should be given on AB 750 to Assemblyman Jerry Lewis for the tremendous amount of research that he put into the bill. Then there were two resolutions — one urging community college districts to utilize their community service taxes for counseling purposes, and one directed to the need for credentialing in the field of early childhood education.

We also have worked to establish local coalitions of women throughout the state. There are some 20 in various stages of organization. We had to work up a structure in which the various women's organizations can work together and serve as an out-reach back to their own groups. This is history-making; it's kind of like putting the country together in 1776.

We've been extremely encouraged at the fantastic increase in interest in women these days. This was true even before women's lib hit the media with a loud bang. The number of establishment types — very prominent women in the community — who wanted to do something about increasing the utilization potential of women — we really haven't had any problem here. Where we've had a problem is in working out the structure in which these groups can work together. And it isn't because they don't want to work together. It's just that each had by-laws, so we've had to invent and create ways that would serve each given community.

Journal: Has the women's lib movement been a problem in organizing these groups?

Heine: There has been concern about it from women who have been members of the traditional organizations, but I don't think it has become a problem. I have seen no interest among the women we have been working with to become members of the groups that are actually known by name as women's liberation. Those are really quite different from what we are talking about. However, new groups are springing up all the time. We are sometimes asked to suggest panels to show the range of thinking, and they'll ask us, "Will you get us an establishment type, a middle type, a middle-middle type, a non-horrible women's lib and then a wild women's lib?" This attempt to categorize people turns me off, however.

Journal: Would it be fair to say that whether you agree with women's lib or not, it certainly has been a force for bringing on this kind of awareness?

Heine: No, I don't think so, because we started on our project in 1967 and we didn't read about picketing of the Miss America Pageant until the summer of 1969 — that really started the bang. It really has been within the last year. And we've been working with these groups for much longer and have found tremendous interest on their part — they've been working with us, helping us gather data before this started.

I certainly think, however, that the media treatment of woman's liberation has helped to focus news attention on this question, and I think, anthropologically speaking, that is healthy because I think men and women need to talk to each other again about the real things that matter with most to us.

Journal: Does the commission reflect the broad spectrum in women's groups today?

Heine: There are no members of women's liberation represented on the commission. One of our members is a member of NOW. There are BPW women, AAUW women, Zonta women, Democrats, Republicans. And we did appoint four young people as advisors last spring. We appointed a young husband and wife, a young community worker from the central valley who is a young mother with Mexican-American background, a graduate of a girl's reform school, and a young career woman in her 20's. And then we have called repeatedly on other teenaged people as consultants.

Journal: Has a mandated state level child care coordinating council been established?

Heine: No, AB 750 mandated coordination to take place in the Compensatory Education Office of the State Department of Education. AB 750 also has contained in it the long-range plan concept. An advisory council is to be set up, the equivalent of a state 4-C's committee, to do, among other things, long-range planning for child care in the state.

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERVIEW *(Continued from previous page)*

Journal: Does the commission take any active role on the subject of abortion?

Heine: We haven't examined that issue.

Journal: It appeared ironic on the face of it that the commission which preceded this commission had relatively weak recommendations in the area of protective labor legislation.

Heine: I think I would disagree. It recommended total retention of existing laws.

Journal: And that's not a weak recommendation?

Heine: Well, it depends on your definition of weak. It strongly felt that what we have now we should keep. I'm sure it would consider that was a strong stand.

Journal: The present commission strongly disagrees?

Heine: I couldn't say that, no. We have only expressed our own empirical evidence, what we believe with reference to the weight lifting law. They recommended that it be retained exactly as is. We recommend that it be appropriately modified and changed, so that it also, in appropriate cases, protects the health of male workers.

Journal: Is there less employment discrimination and greater equal employment opportunity for women today than six years ago?

Heine: I think there have been some fine advances in employment opportunity that have arisen primarily because of the federal law, which was passed in 1965, and because there have been status of women commissions around the country. And just a greater concern on the part of women.

However, I think some very pervasive discriminations still remain in employment. I think they will be solved; I think the employers in the state and around the county have made some very fine advances in their attitudes about racial discrimination. I think people are slow to change their attitudes about place, but I think some fine advances have been made, and I think they will be made in this area, too. It's interesting to note, however, that the percentage of women entering the professions is declining; the numbers are greater, but less percentagewise. And, as of last year, the median earnings of women compared with men are going down rather than up. Now, we're delighted that men are apparently making more money, but women are not keeping pace. In 1959, for every dollar earned by men, women with all their earnings lumped together, earned 65¢. In 1966, it was 58¢.

Journal: What about the future for women's legislation?

Heine: I think we're going to see more women running for public office at all levels, both as independents and within party structures. I think we will see more legislation having to do with child care, not necessarily a lot more that government should do so much as finding new ways to encourage private solutions which might well take legislation in the form of tax breaks or depreciation allowances — this kind of thing. I think that we will probably be seeing some new practices in higher education in terms of more women at professorial levels. I think we will see more women attending city council meetings and committee meetings in the Legislature, in Congress. I think we will see much more activism in dignified and responsible ways by dignified and responsible women, which can otherwise just be called "How to be a Good Citizen."

PASS-ON BILL *(Continued from page 285)*

which readily accepted the pass-on amendment, signed the report, and sent the bill to the floor for a vote in the closing hours of the session.

In skillfully maneuvering the pass-on provision back before both houses, Burton had relied on two accepted parliamentary practices. First, conference committees meet in secret and by waiting until the conference committee to make any substantive amendments he was able to avoid signaling his intentions. Second, many conference committees merely correct errors in bills or remove conflicts between bills, and their reports are adopted as a matter of routine. Normally, substantive issues, involving important policy differences between the two houses are indicated in floor debate before a bill is sent to conference committee. No such issues were raised in discussion of the Townsend bill, and the conference report therefore had every appearance of merely being routine. The Assembly accepted the report by a vote of 60-1, and the Senate followed with a vote of 25-11. The bill then went to the Governor's desk.

As it passed the Legislature, AB 1712 exempted the first $7.50 of income from need computations for recipients in adult categories (OAS, blind, disabled), and it also exempted an additional $4 per month for recipients who receive the mandatory social security pass-on, for as long as Congress requires it. Thus, those with social security as their outside income receive a full $11.50 income exemption.

On September 19, two days before the bill-signing deadline, Governor Reagan reversed his earlier position and signed AB 1712.

What caused the Governor's reversal? Assemblyman Burton gave one explanation to the *California Journal.* In mid-September, according to Burton, a group of senior citizens traveled to Sacramento to urge Governor Reagan to sign the bill. Reagan was away, but the group learned that he was to address some 200 campaign supporters at the World Trade Center in San Francisco that night, and they hurried to the city to catch him just as he arrived to give his speech. According to the *San Francisco Chronicle's* account of this meeting, an Oakland woman demanded if the Governor intended to sign AB 1712. According to the report, the Governor replied with an implication that he would not. In the television clips of this scene, as Burton recalls, the camera panned in on a 70-year-old woman in tears telling Reagan how she had to live on $140 a month and that she needed the $7.50 that the Governor had been taking away from her. "That did it," says Burton. "His campaign managers, Spencer and Roberts, took a look at that and told Reagan to forget the philosophy and sign the bill. And he did."

Burton's version is denied by the Reagan administration. A staff aide says that the Assemblyman failed to ask them at any time what their position was. "He's wrong," he told the *California Journal.* "Burton just figured what would make the most headlines and used that as the reason. The Governor's position has consistently been that there are people on welfare who really shouldn't be on it, and they are taking money away from the aged. But the only step that we were given by the Legislature was the increase for the aged. And even though there are still some inequities, the Governor signed the bill."

Thus ends the saga of the social security pass-on . . . or does it?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislative Analyst Reports on Federal Aid Funds

According to Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post, California can expect to receive $3.6 billion in federal funds in fiscal year 1970-71. Of this total, $1.2 billion will be spent by state agencies for current expense and $343 million will go for capital outlay. Approximately $1.8 billion will pass through state agencies to be spent locally, and another $200 million will go directly from federal sources to local government agencies.

Post's figures indicate that federal aid to all fifty states and to local governments will reach $27.6 billion for 1970-71, up $3.5 billion or 14.5 percent from the previous year. Almost all of this is distributed as grants-in-aid; only $.4 billion or 1.4 percent is shared revenues. California's estimated share amounts to 13 percent of the total.

Actual figures for 1968-69 show that California received $2.2 billion in that year, approximately 11 percent of the total nationally. These figures, which are compiled differently than those estimates prepared by the state, show California's share declining by four percent from 1966-67 through 1968-69, although the absolute amount of aid to this state grew by $500 million over that period.

Nearly half of the federal funds (46 percent) are distributed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, but large amounts are also distributed by the Department of Transportation (17 percent), Department of Agriculture (10 percent) and Department of Housing and Urban Development (9 percent). The major recipients in California are the University of California, welfare programs, Medi-Cal, and the state highway program.

The Analyst estimates that California received $113 per capita in 1968-69 as compared with the national average of $100 per capita. However, California also paid higher than average federal taxes — $118 per capita; in effect the state paid $5.54 more per capita in federal taxes than it received in federal funds. As the Analyst points out, however, this federal spending is only a small part of total federal spending in California (through defense contracts, etc.).

In 1965, the Legislature directed the Analyst's office to serve as an information center for state-federal relations and to report annually on the extent and impact of federal aid programs. The Analyst's fifth annual report on federal aid programs, issued on August 31st, 1970, is devoted in greater part to studies of eight specific aid programs in the areas of health, education, employment, housing and crime. The Analyst's office also directs the work of the Legislature's office in Washington, D.C., which is intended to keep the Legislature informed of all federal legislation and programs which have an impact on this state.

CANNON *(Continued from page 289)*

idiots. I do not know Mr. Garth, but his Tunney television spots in the general election capture the man far better than the overblown and pretentious primary TV spots they replaced. The Garth spots, by the way, are far more "natural" and less deceptive than their predecessors.

Hadley Roff, the Tunney communications director, also understands about voters — and about the needs of reporters who cover candidates. "Tunney's not an orchid to be protected," Roff said at one point. "He's the candidate." Bill Roberts understands, too. He kept Murphy away from reporters as much as he could during the campaign and with good reason.

OBSERVATION NO. 7: **Campaign staffers know their own campaigns best.** "We could do with some of his well-advertised Irish humor," complained one of Murphy's staffers after a trying day in the Senate campaign.

"We were thinking of kidnapping Jess to create some sympathy," joked an Unruh strategist, "But we canceled it because we were afraid that the advance man would go to the wrong house and get the wrong man."

Or, as Carmen Warschaw is reputed to have said: "What do you want — good government or good taste?"

There are some Californians, this reporter among them, who at times in this campaign questioned whether we have either.

State College Trustees Adopt $309 Million 70-71 Budget

The Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges has approved a current expense budget request amounting to $309.3 million for 1971-72. This figure is $58.7 million more than the state colleges received from the Governor and Legislature for the current year. The increase includes $32.2 million for enrollment growth, $5.6 million to restore programs cut from this year's budget, and $6.2 million in program augmentations. The balance of $14.7 million is to cover price increases.

Earlier, the Regents of the University of California passed a 1971-72 budget asking for $375.2 million in state funds. The University's budget calls for an increase of $38 million in state support over the current year. The greater part of this increase is to cover a planned 11.2 percent increase in health science enrollment, a 4 percent over-all enrollment growth, price increases, and certain "critical operating deficiencies".

In presenting the state college budget to the Trustees, Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke charged that quality higher education in California is being "eroded" by inadequate state funding and that the state colleges may no longer be able to admit all eligible students. Total budget figures for the past four years demonstrate, however, that the state colleges have been relatively more successful than the University in obtaining additional state support.

While University enrollment has increased by 28 percent over the past four years, state support, after deducting price increases, has gone up by only 21 percent. For the State colleges, however, enrollment growth has been 50 percent during this period and state support has increased by 67 percent, after deducting for inflation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two other prominent single commodity processor organizations are the Wine Institute and the Dairy Institute. Both require extensive organizations because of the heavily regulated nature of their commodities and because of their need to defend their economic position in relation to the producers on one hand and the retailers on the other. The Wine Institute's staff includes contract lobbyists and former legislators Jefferson Peyser and Paul Lunardi. The Dairy Institute is represented by John Gilmore. Former Dairy Institute lobbyist Bob Beckus now represents the Knudsen Corporation, a major milk processing firm, which has been engaged in a running battle with the Institute and the State Department of Agriculture over the resale pricing provisions of the Milk Stabilization Act.

Food retailers belong to one or both of two organizations, the California Retailers Association or the more specific California Grocers Association. Both groups work closely together and most of the lobbying on retail food problems is done by the head of the latter, Merle Goddard.

Agricultural suppliers such as the chemical industry and banks also have Sacramento assistance. The Bank of America has long enjoyed a position of considerable influence in agricultural circles, and in recent years has been the source of Governor Brown's last State Board of Agricultural president, the late Jesse Tapp, and Earl Coke, Reagan's first Director of the Department of Agriculture and now Agriculture and Services Administrator.

Finally, some agri-business conglomerates now maintain their own representation. For example, the giant Tenneco (formerly Kern County Land Company) and Di Giorgio corporations are represented individually by lobbyist Hunt Conrad.

Agri-business interests are informally coordinated by the Agricultural Department of the State Chamber of Commerce, another statewide organization which recenlty moved its headquarters to Sacramento. Jim Van Maren handles this duty for the Chamber along with its new consumer program. A second informal coordinating group is the Agricultural Round Table, a morning breakfast group of agricultural representatives.

These efforts at coordination have undoubtedly produced significant compromises and eliminated some duplication of effort and misunderstandings. As agricultural groups become even more professional in Sacramento they should continue to augment their capacity to keep family quarrels out of the legislative process. However, the honing of these professional skills could merely serve to make the donnybrooks more spectacular when they do break out. Even though, theoretically, unity should become more attainable when the enemy is external, the recent history of the farm labor question indicates that the "farm bloc" is and will continue to be more a cluster than a monolith.

After his defeat in 1952, Adlai Stevenson told this story about Abraham Lincoln's remarks upon losing an election early in his career: "They asked him how he felt once after an unsuccessful election. He said he felt like a little boy who had stubbed his toe in the dark; that he was too old to cry, but it hurt too much to laugh."

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS

APPOINTED

Dr. C. Carson Conrad, 59, of Sacramento, head of the State Department of Education's Bureau of Health and Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation, as Executive Director of the President's Council on Physical Fitness.

Howard Day, 58, President of the State Board of Education, to the Office of Economic Opportunity's National Advisory Council, by President Nixon. Day will be the only Californian serving on the 18-member anti-poverty board.

Assemblywoman March K. Fong to the Education Commission of the States by commission chairman, Governor Russell W. Peterson of Delaware.

Dr. William B. Langsdorf, 61, President of Fullerton State College, as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, by California State Colleges Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke, effective December 1, 1970.

Richard W. Lyman, 46, Stanford University historian and acting president since last June, as President of the University, by the University's Board of Trustees.

Joe P. Maldonado, Executive Director of the Economic Youth Opportunities Agency in Los Angeles, as Director of Program Development in the Office of Economic Opportunity, by the federal Office of Economic Opportunity.

Fred V. Malek, 33, Deputy Undersecretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, as a special assistant to the President for recruiting candidates for top posts in the administration, by President Nixon.

John N. McLaurin, 55, a Los Angeles attorney with Hill, Farrer, and Burrill, to the California Law Revision Commission, by Governor Reagan, subject to Senate confirmation.

Judge Robert H. Schnacke of the San Francisco Superior Court and former state Deputy Director of Corporations from 1947-50, to the Federal District Court, Northern California region, by President Nixon.

Dr. L. Donald Shields, 34, Vice President for Administration at Fullerton State College, as Acting President of the college, by California State Colleges Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke, effective December 1, 1970.

Turner B. Shelton of Beverly Hills, a career diplomat with the U.S. Foreign Service in the Bahamas, as ambassador to Nicaragua, by President Nixon.

Mrs. Paula Adams Tennant, 57, member of the California Youth Authority Board since 1968 and former District Attorney of Lassen County, to a six-year term on the U.S. Board of Parole, by President Nixon.

ELECTED

Steven Edney, 53, President of the Cannery and Industrial Workers Union at Terminal Island, as a regional vice president of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. Edney becomes the first black elected to the 37-member executive council.

Dr. Sally Sperling, as Chairman of the Academic Senate at UC Riverside. Dr. Sperling, who has taught psychology on the UCR faculty since 1961, is reported to be the first woman in UC's history to be elected chairman of a campus senate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CALIFORNIA CALENDAR

INTERIM LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

Nov. 9-10 **Assembly Public Employment and Retirement Committee.** 11/9: Rm. 310, County Administration Bldg., San Diego, 9:00 a.m.; 11/10: Rm. 207, Community Concourse Bldg., San Diego. 10:00 a.m. Subject: Consideration of statutory definition for safety membership and funding of retirement system liabilities.
Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee on Mental Health Services. Rm. 115, 217 West First St., Los Angeles. 9:30 a.m. Subject: Implementation of Lanterman-Petris-Short Act and Patton State Hospital.

Nov. 10 **Senate Education Committee.** Rm. 4203, State Captiol, 9:30 a.m. Subject: Adult education.

Nov. 12 **Assembly Agriculture Committee.** Council Chambers, City Hall, 990 Palm St., San Luis Obispo. 9:00 a.m. Subject: Federal Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 and the California Meat and Poultry Act of 1970.
Assembly Transportation Subcommittee on **Air Pollution.** Rm. 1138, State Bldg., 107 So. Broadway, Los Angeles. 9:30 a.m. Subject: Statutory authority of Air Resources Board and recommendations for improvement.

Nov. 13 **Assembly Transportation Committee.** Rm. 1138, State Bldg., 107 So. Broadway, Los Angeles. 10:00 a.m. Subject: Allocation of highway user funds.
Assembly Water Committee. County Board of Supervisors Chambers, M and Tulare Sts., Fresno. 10:00 a.m. Subject: Analysis of operation of Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District.

Nov. 16-17 **Senate Finance Committee.** Rm. 5007, State Capitol, Sacramento. 9:30 a.m. Subject: Compensation and benefits of public employees.

Nov. 17-18 **Assembly Water Committee.** Rm. 2170, State Captiol, Sacramento. 9:30 a.m. Subject: Regulation of waste discharges from watercraft.

Nov. 18-19 **Senate Select Committee on Salinity Intrusion in Agricultural Soils.** County Supervisors' Chambers, County Courthouse, 651 Pine St., Martinez. 9:00 a.m. Subject: Salinity intrusion in the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta area.

Nov. 19 **Assembly Ways and Means Committee.** Board of Education Hearing Rm., 170 Fell St., San Francisco. Subject: Financing staff and administration of state hospital system.

Nov. 19-20 **Senate Insurance and Financial Institutions Committee.** Water Authority Bldg., 2750 Fourth Avenue, San Diego. 10:00 a.m. Subject: Disability insurance and housing.
Assembly Commerce and Public Utilities Committee. Rm. 2133, State Capitol. Subject: Fire extinguishing and fire alarm systems.
Assembly Education Committee. Rm. 1138 State Bldg., 107 South Broadway, Los Angeles. 9:30 a.m. Subject: School finance and school building aid.

Nov. 20 **Senate Judiciary Committee.** Moot Court Room, Hastings Law School, San Francisco. 9:30 a.m. Subject: Juvenile laws.

Nov. 23 **Senate Business and Professions Committee.** Monterey. Subject: Licensing of practical nurses.

Nov. 23-25 **Assembly Finance and Insurance Committee.** State Capitol. 10:00 a.m. Subject: 11/23 — Investment guarantee insurance and municipal liability insurance; 11/24 — Joint hearing with Public Employment and Retirement Committee. Subject: Workman's compensation.

Nov. 24 **Assembly Transportation Subcommittee on Air Pollution.** Rm. 1138, State Bldg., 107 South Broadway, Los Angeles. 9:30 a.m. Subject: Fuel composition and potential in smog production.

Nov. 30-Dec. 1 **Senate Natural Resources and Wildlife Committee.** Santa Barbara. Subject: Environmental protection program needs.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Nov. 9 **Coordinating Council on Higher Education.** Host of Sacramento Hotel, Metropolitan Airport, Sacramento. 9:00 a.m.

Nov. 12-13 **State Board of Education.** Auditorium, Resources Bldg., 1416 Ninth St., Sacramento. 9:00 a.m.
State Park and Recreation Commission. Rm. 1194, State Office Bldg., Annex, 455 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco. 11/12 — 10:00 a.m., 11/13 — 9:30 a.m.

Nov. 13 **Board of Corrections.** Rm. 290, State Office Bldg. 1, 915 Capitol Mall, Sacramento. 9:00 a.m.

Nov. 18-19 **California Highway Commission.** Public Works Bldg., 1120 N St., Sacramento. 10:00 a.m.

Nov. 19 **Commission of Housing and Community Development.** Department Conference Rm., 1121 O St., Sacramento. 1:30 p.m.
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Rm. 1194, State Bldg., 455 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco. 2:00 p.m.

Nov. 19-20 **State Social Welfare Board.** San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco International Airport. 9:00 a.m.
University of California Board of Regents. University Extension Center, Los Angeles.

Nov. 23-24 **California State Colleges Board of Trustees.** Third Floor Auditorium, Office of the Chancellor, 5670 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles. 9:00 a.m.

Nov. 30 **State Public Works Board.** Rm. 6028, State Capitol, Sacramento. 2:00 p.m.

Dec. 2-3 **California Community Colleges Board of Governors.** Hyatt House, San Francisco International Airport, Burlingame. 9:00 a.m.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Selected State Government Reports

EDUCATION

Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning, by Ernest G. Palola, Timothy Lehmann, and William R. Blischke. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. 1970, 627 pages. Major section on implementation of Master Plan for California Higher Education with a critical analysis of California's coordination and planning structure.

Special Education in California, 1968-69. Division of Special Education, Dept. of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento. 1970. 20 pages.

A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes on Collective Bargaining, by James O. Haehn. Statewide Academic Senate, California State Colleges. May 1970, 42 pages. Survey of opinion on collective bargaining and faculty organization indicating that 61 percent of state college faculty favor collective bargaining for faculty.

The Way to Relevance and Accountability in Education. Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation, State Capitol, Sacramento. 1970, 35 pages.

ENVIRONMENT

Air Pollution in the San Francisco Bay Area; Final Report. Stanford Workshop on Air Pollution, Ecology Center Press, 1360 Howard St., San Francisco 94103. Summer 1970, 380 pages. ($5.00) Incisive analysis of Bay air pollution problem with ratings of the effectiveness of smog board directors.

What Price Environment. California Resources Agency, Resources Bldg., 1416 Ninth St., Sacramento 95814. May 1970, 17 pages. Speeches by Resources Agency officials.

Atoms for Peace. Joint Committee on Atomic Development and Space. September 1970, 20 pages. A Committee report which discusses the significance of nuclear power as a principle source of additional electric generating capacity within California, and offers recommendations for development of nuclear plants. Write Assemblyman John V. Briggs, Rm. 2165, State Capitol, Sacramento 95814. ($1 ea. Make checks payable to State of California.)

A Dozen Murders Solved. Planning and Conservation League, 909 - 12th St., Sacramento 95814. October 1970, 17 pages. A study of environmental legislation introduced during the 1970 legislative session with an analysis and vote tabulation of the dozen key measures killed and the two measures passed.

Rebuttal to the 1970 Planning and Conservation League's 1970 Environmental Quality Legislative Index by Assemblyman Gene Chappie, Rm. 3173, State Capitol, Sacramento 95814. October 1970, 4 pages.

FINANCE AND TAXATION

California Tax Legislation 1970 by Pamela Pecarich, Assistant Consultant, Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation. September 1970, 27 pages. An analysis of tax legislation in 1970 including inheritance tax appraisal reform, tax incentives and the environment, property tax relief for disaster areas, etc.

Some Elements of Tax Reform. State Board of Equalization, 1020 N St., Sacramento 95814. February 1970, 22 pages. A report recommending several basic elements which should be included in any comprehensive tax reform legislation, prepared particularly for the 1970 legislative session.

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

The Role of the States in the Urban Crisis. The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, 4722 Broadway, Kansas City, Missouri 64112. June 4, 1970, 15 pages. An address by Larry Margolis, Executive Director, to the Midwest American Assembly, St. Louis, Missouri.

A Report to the People. California State Assembly. 1970, 32 pages. A general summary of legislative accomplishments for 1970 covering major subject areas and related legislation.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Benefits and Information for California Veterans. Department of Veterans Affairs, 1227 O St., Sacramento 95814. 1970, 103 pages.

Complaints and Fair Hearings in Public Assistance Programs. Department of Social Welfare, 744 P St., Sacramento 95814. April 1970, 7 pages.

Old Age Security; General Information. Department of Social Welfare. 1970, 6 pages.

Progress Report, 1968-69, for the Department of Rehabilitation's Alcoholism Program. Dept. of Rehabilitation. 1970, 133 pages.

Welfare in California. Report to the State Senate by the Senate Committee on Governmental Efficiency. August 1970, 127 pages. This study focuses on problems and issues involved in social welfare reorganization reforms, especially as posed by SB 315 (Alquist) of the 1970 session.

MISCELLANEOUS

1970 California Comprehensive Plan for Criminal Justice. California Council on Criminal Justice, 1108 14th St., Sacramento 95814. 1970, 283 pages. A report on the current administration of criminal justice programs in California.

Final Summary of Legislative and Executive Action on the Budget Bill and Other Measures with Fiscal Implications — 1970 Regular Session. Legislative Analyst, October 1, 1970, 109 pages.

A Pilot Study of California State Employee Workmen's Compensation and Other Work-Related Disability Benefits. Commission on California State Governmental Organization and Economy, 11th and L Bldg., Sacramento 95814. 1970, 46 pages.

Landlord and Tenant Relations; A Selective Bibliography, compiled by Barbara Jackson, California State Law Library, Sacramento 95814. February 1970, 7 pages.

Union Pay Rates and Supplemental Benefits; Ten California Cities. Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, P.O. Box 603, San Francisco 94101. 1970, 21 pages.

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, reports may be obtained by writing the committee or agency, c/o State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recent Books on State Government and Politics

The following list of recent books on California government and politics has been compiled with the hope that it will be useful for readers who may wish either to extend their own reading or to select gifts for others.

Big Wayward Girl, by Herbert L. Phillips. Doubleday & Company: Garden Grove, New York, 1968. 288 pp. $5.95.
Reporter Phillips writes what he describes as an "informal political history of California," sketching the fickle, impulsive and occasionally capricious political personality with which this state has often dismayed local and distant observers over the years.

But What's He Really Like? by Kathy Randall Davis. Pacific Coast Publishers: Menlo Park, 1970. 113 pp. $5.95.
The former private secretary to Governor Reagan provides an interesting insight into the personal side of the Governor's day-to-day work.

California Government: One in Fifty (Second Edition), by C. E. Jacobs and A. D. Sokolow. Macmillan: New York, 1970. Paper, $3.25.
This is an introductory text on California government emphasizing comparisons with other states and comparable institutions at the federal level.

California Handbook, Thaddeus C. Trzyna and William Shank, Eds. Center for California Public Affairs, P.O. Box 505, Claremont, California 91711. 300 pp. 1969. $7.30.
This handbook provides a comprehensive listing by subject of source material and facts on California state government.

California Information Almanac, Edward and Evelyn Salitore. Lakewood, California, 1969. 653 pp. Paper.

California Politics and Parties, John R. Owens, Edmond Costantini, and Louis F. Weschler. Macmillan Company: Toronto, 1970. 324 pp. $7.95. Paper, $3.75.
This is an advanced textbook on California's politics, parties, and elections.

California's Prodigal Sons, Spencer C. Olin, Jr. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968. 182 pp. $6.95.
Professor Olin writes of the rise and fall of the Progressive Party and its leader in California, Hiram Johnson.

The Challenge of California, With a Concise Introduction to California Government, Eugene C. Lee and Willis D. Hawley, Eds. Little Brown & Company: Boston, 1970. 328 pp. Paper, $3.95.
Lee and Hawley offer an excellent collection of essays and articles asking difficult questions about governmental issues, processes, and institutions.

Dancing Bear: An Inside Look at California Politics, Gladwin Hill. World Publishing Company: Cleveland, 1968. 303 pp. $6.50
As the title suggests, this is an eminently witty and readable political history of California by the Los Angeles Bureau Chief of the *New York Times*.

The Dynamics of California Government and Politics, Richard B. Harvey. Wadsworth Publishing Company: Belmont, California, 1970. 301 pp. Paper.
A new text on state government, this one attempts to focus more on political dynamism than on a static description of institutions and processes.

How to Kill a Golden State, William Bronson. Doubleday: Garden City, 1968. 224 pp. $6.95.
A blunt and provocative description of the pollution and destruction of California illustrated with over 300 photographs.

Introduction to California Government (Second Edition), Eugene P. Dvorin and Arthur J. Misner. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company: Menlo Park, California, 1969. 165 pp. Paper, $3.50.
This is a relatively brief general survey of California state and local government.

The Last Days of the Late, Great State of California, Curt Gentry. Balantine Books: New York, 1968. 401 pp. Paper, $.95.
Gentry describes contemporary California culture and the possible impact on the nation if the state were indeed to disappear as the result of a vast earthquake.

Old-Age Politics in California, Jackson K. Putnam. Stanford University Press: Palo Alto, 1970. $7.50.
This is a survey of California's efforts to deal with the problems of the aged beginning with the administration of Governor Richardson (1923).

Politics and Government in California (Sixth Edition), Bernard L. Hyink, Seyom Brown, and Ernest W. Thacker. Thomas Y. Crowell Company: New York, 1969. 303 pp. Paperback, $3.75.
This is one of the standard college texts on politics and government in California.

Politics in California, Robert L. Morlan and Leroy C. Hardy. Dickinson Publishing Company: Belmont, California, 1968. 122 pp.
Part of the excellent Dickinson Series in California Government, this slim volume focuses on local and state politics and elections.

Reagan and Reality: The Two Californias, Edmund G. (Pat) Brown. Praeger Publishers: New York, 1970. 235 pp. $6.95.
Former Governor Brown writes about contemporary California politics and his successor in the governor's office.

The Rumble of California Politics: 1848-1970, Royce D. Delmatier, Clarence F. McIntosh, Earl G. Waters, Eds. John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1970. 483 pp. $9.95. Paper, $5.95.
Delmatier and company have collected 13 essays covering California politics from the Treaty of Guadalupe to the June 2, 1970, Primary Election.

Ronnie & Jesse: A Political Odyssey, Lou Cannon. Doubleday & Company: Garden City, New York, 1969. 340 pp. $7.95.
Newspaperman Lou Cannon has written a penetrating pre-election analysis of California's 1970 gubernatorial candidates which traces their rise to political power, examines their individual political personalities, and presents a sharp image of the development of California politics over the past two decades.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Frankly, I think the chroniclers of our times have overlooked the meteoric beauty and brevity of my political career.

– Adlai E. Stevenson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED